

FACTS and SUGGESTIONS for Level-Headed  
Voters Who Prize Patriotism More than  
Partyism. Are You One? . . . . .

JF 493  
.U6 A7  
Copy 1

# IN HELL AND THE WAY OUT

“Our POOR are living in a perpetual HELL in which the  
conditions are becoming more unbearable.”—Florence E. Kelley

---

. . .Price 10 Cents . . .



# IN HELL AND THE WAY OUT,

## A NON-PARTISAN, POLITICAL HAND-BOOK.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PRESENT CONDITIONS.  
AND A PLAN OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY OUTLINED.

25.7  
8120.  
RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED TO THE FARMERS AND TRADE  
UNIONISTS OF AMERICA.

BY ONE OF THEIR NUMBER.

\* \* \* \*

CHICAGO:  
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY.

---

Copyright 1896 by Henry E. Allen.

JF4-3  
1071

## PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

The first edition of this little work was published by the author, and five thousand copies were circulated through his personal efforts. He has now given the plates and copyright to the coöperative company of which I am manager, as a contribution to the cause of social progress. In consequence of this, we shall furnish copies by the hundred at a very low rate to those wishing them to give away, and we shall devote all the profits above the most necessary expenses to the circulation of other literature of reform.

Direct Legislation seems a certainty of the near future. We may, therefore, work with good courage to hasten its coming ; but it is none too soon to face the next question : What shall we do with it when we get it? There is no lack of books full of suggestions on this point, but for several years I have been looking for one which should point out a definite, practical plan of political action which should secure to the worker the full product of his labor without either increasing the burdens of taxation or using the force of the government to confiscate the wealth acquired under existing laws.

I believe I have found it at last, and it is my hope that every reader of "In Hell and the Way Out" will send for a copy of "Uncle Sam in Business," and learn from it what the voters of this country will be able to do for their own emancipation when once direct legislation is a fact.

CHARLES H. KERR.

## INTRODUCTORY TO SECOND EDITION.

More than two years ago, when this handbook was published, the question of Direct Legislation was comparatively new. Not so to-day. It has passed the gamut of falsehood and abuse, and I believe it practically stands approved by a majority of the American people if an honest expression of all parties could be taken.

The person who opposes Direct Legislation and still claims to believe in free government occupies a ludicrous position,—a similar position to the pretender who boasted that he believed in Christianity but was opposed to the golden rule.

To attempt to prove that representative government is not a failure to-day would be tantamount to proving that the sun does not shine at 12 o'clock, noon. In fact men are scarce who can attempt such a demonstration and keep their faces straight.

Scratch the man who opposes Direct Legislation and you are likely to find either ignorance or supposed self-interest, or both.

To say that we oppose direct vote is virtually saying that we do not favor popular rule. The person who opposes popular rule—majority rule—the rule of the people—is certainly out of place in a republic. He should betake himself to a monarchy.

Pure democracy has but one meaning—the rule of the people. It is the ideal in government, and every political reform through all the ages has tended toward this ideal.

The two vital issues to-day in every civilized nation on earth are DIRECT LEGISLATION and PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.

Monopoly is crowding these issues to the front in a man-

ner unprecedented in the history of the race. There are either better or perilous times just ahead of us. Reader, whatever ticket we may vote in the campaign of 1900 let us stand together on this vital proposition:

“No people can be Self-Governing who are denied the privilege to vote YES or No upon every important law that is to Govern them.” Though it be true that “gold bars the way to all reforms,” I believe the intelligent majority are to-day facing the sunrise, and that the new time,—the better day,—is just ahead.

Yours for better conditions,

HENRY E. ALLEN.

Berwick, Ill., Feb., 1899.





# IN HELL.

IS THERE A WAY OUT OF PRESENT CONDITIONS?

It will hardly be denied that the liberalizing trend of thought in recent years has done much to uproot the old belief in a "literal hell" and a "personal devil."

Whatever purpose these beliefs may have conserved in the childhood of the race they seem now to be well towards the head in the procession of the century's vanishing myths.

After all are we not indebted to these mythical conceptions for the one word coinage which symbolizes better than any other word in human language the acme of bad conditions? Is there any other word which so fully signifies and typifies blank and black despair? Whatever may be our religious convictions—or whether we have any—this oft-repeated word somehow seems to set forth the suffering, wretchedness and misery that may come to a human being better than any other word, and we are apt to repeat it with a shudder. Why? Is it because so many of us have come to know from experience its ancient, deeper meaning? Is it for the reason that it is no longer necessary for us to be "sent to hell" or to go to hell, but because it is so easy under present conditions for hell to come to us?

It is certainly beyond dispute that the most of us—to use the parlance of the day and the rather expressive words of Kate Field—are having "a hell of a time," are fast coming to the conclusion that this is "a hell of a condition," and that we are all more or less in it.

What little I have seen of hell (have lived in Chicago but a few years and have never been a resident of New York) convinces me that it is merely a condition—not a locality,—and that all who are "in hell," and are having "a hell of a time," are not in it from choice, are not in love with it, and would like mighty well to get out, (republicans and democrats excepted.)

Of late it seems that hell and politics have in someway got mixed, and the mixture is not a success. From all accounts

hell must be bad enough without having any politics in it.

Perhaps I already owe the reader an apology for using the term hell;—it is a word that grates harshly on nearly all ears. But in a study of politics as well as theology, is not the use of the term a necessity? Hasn't hell been dropping out of theology and into politics? It may have been an element of merit in theology but it certainly has not improved politics.

But is not hell losing its terrors? Is not the belief becoming current that after all the problematical hell may be even better than our political and industrial hades into which so many have found their way? There may be very trying conditions in the other hell, but if it is any worse than we have found it under Cleveland the manager ought to be ashamed of himself. If he persists in being that kind of a manager we will be forced to conclude that he belongs to the "Manager's Association." But why should such an old, experienced manager allow Cleveland and congress to out-manage him in a gold-standard country like this?—Are we to understand these are rival establishments or a trust?

But why is it that the United States and hell are synonymous terms to millions of our people? Let me tell you. It is because three destructive agencies are sapping the foundations of popular government. Three dangers now confront us never provided against by the framers of our constitution; these are :—

- 1 SELFISHNESS, ENGENDERED BY PRESENT CONDITIONS.
- 2 THE MONEY POWER.
- 3 INEFFICIENCY OF OUR REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM.

Is it necessary to prove that present conditions are breeding a race of human blood-suckers? Are not the evidences on every hand? Only recently thousands of sweat-shop workers were on the verge of starvation both in Chicago and New York, and to my knowledge not one of the scores of millionaires within elbow reach offered a penny or protest to relieve the suffering. Think of holding thousands of dependent women and children in hunger and wretchedness simply to retain a business advantage! Has any other age, civilized or barbarous, permitted human misery to be made a matter of wholesale barter as at present? For profit we are turning our factories into charnel houses; for profit we rate child and animal labor the same, and mules and men of equal value.



Ignatius Donnelly says in *Golden Battle*: "There is more devil in man than in all the wild animals put together; more of a cunning, complex, insatiable, unfathomable devil,—wolf, tiger, fox, gorilla, lion, jackal,—all stirred together in one horrible compound." Almost every newspaper teems with proofs.

Selfishness is the root sin of the age.

Present conditions which are rapidly leading us on to anarchial plutocracy foster its growth. Generous impulses are stifled. Those who are true and noble are so in defiance of their environment.

When a poor man is treated as a criminal by society simply because he is poor is it surprising that greed and avarice are the master incentives of the day?

I charge that excessive wealth is wholly responsible for the hell into which our nation has been plunged. The low mark it has set for civilization disgraces the intelligence of our time. Its unwise and selfish use of property and power demonstrates the urgent necessity of curtailment—the necessity of a succession property tax.

It is susceptible of proof that less than one thousand wealth owners are responsible for the wide-spread unrest and discontent of our nation to-day, for the present harrowing and dangerous conditions of American life,—the hell of the year 1896.

Emerson well said: "It is high time our bad wealth came to an end."

Let us not be unmindful of these facts: Extreme wealth in every nation produces extreme poverty. When the wealth of a country aggregates in the hands of a few the masses must be poor. Excessive wealth is invariably ill-gotten. The last census reports furnish proof that we are rapidly becoming a nation of millionaires and paupers. I say a system is already damned that will conduce to such conditions.

In recent years individual selfishness has acquired an intensified form, and under the operation of *organized* selfishness almost every phase of tyranny and oppression is possible. Organized selfishness is deadening the public conscience to the appeals of humanity, and fostering the principles of despotism.

But if there is one thing in all the world barren of honor, soul, feeling or conscience it is the second of our triumvirate, THE MONEY POWER, the result of selfishness.

No crime is too heinous to serve its purpose. It makes long prayers and short wages; prefers property rights to human rights and has "nothing to arbitrate." With an insatiable appetite it gnaws at the marrow-bone of privilege. It is crowding our prisons, brothels and insane asylums, and has rung in an alarming era of divorce, drunkenness and suicide. It is fast reducing American agriculture to a system of English tenantry. It gloats over the delicate flesh of women and children, and its vampire of debt stalks across the threshold of more than two-thirds of our American homes. It corners gold then insists that the business of the world shall be transacted on the narrow volume of this one metal. The money power of to-day is all this and more!

Since this octopus has acquired such proportions the

#### INEFFICIENCY OF OUR REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM

must be apparent to all who have given the matter unprejudiced thought. The history of legislation for the past twenty years furnishes conclusive proof that this system has worked to perfection in aiding the money power to enrich itself at the expense of the people. In proof of this statement I cite the following facts:

John Clark Ridpath, the historian, has proven that our present national debt represents more wealth than did our entire national debt of 3000 million dollars at the close of the war, thirty yeary ago. These are Mr. Ridpath's words :

"For thirty years the American people have been paying into that horrible maelstrom the volume of their great resources, They have paid on their debt, or at least they have paid, in this long period such a prodigious sum that arithmetic can hardly express it. The imagination cannot embrace it and yet it is the truth of the living God that in the year 1896 the national debt of the United States will purchase as its equivalent in value as much of the average of twenty-five of the leading commodities of the American market, including real estate and labor, as the same debt would purchase at its maximum on the first of March, 1866. The people have paid and paid for thirty years, and at the end have paid just this --- NOTHING !

The money power has brought about this condition by striking down nearly one-half of our coin circulation in demonetizing silver. Consequently shrinkage of values has kept pace with our shrinking money volume. Hence the above startling and important fact. \*

Abraham Lincoln said : "If a government contracts a debt with a certain amount of money in circulation and then con-

---

\* Momentous and alarming as this fact is, that we have paid about 1600 million dollars on our national debt without actually reducing it a dollar, our so-called pluto-

tracts the money volume before the debt is paid, it is the most heinous crime a government can commit against the people."

What shall we say of a representative system which has for so many years utterly failed to check legislation favorable to class interests and gold monopoly?

During the years this contraction process was carried on the money power received through its pliant tools in congress 200 million acres of land and 100 million dollars in guaranteed interest-bearing railroad bonds,—a sum sufficient to build and equip every needed railroad in the United States. Still the government does not control one foot of railroad and never will so long as the money power controls the government. Another little item of more than 300 million dollars (not including the recent appropriation of 275 million dollars) has been expended for river and harbor improvement. The reader must be the judge as to what amount of this vast sum was honestly expended for the public good. But this is not all. Congress has allowed the English aristocracy to secure nearly 74 million acres of our best farming lands which should have been held in reserve for American workingmen.

When we consider what substantial benefit the people have derived from the bestowal of all this wealth, to say nothing of the hundreds of millions expended on our water-logged navy, concessions made to the banking interests, and various contributions made to the money power through tariff schedules, etc., then we can begin to form a correct opinion of what congress has been doing all these years for working people.

Is it any matter for surprise that congress has made more millionaires since the war than all the world besides has made during the past two hundred years? It is safe to say no other people have been so egregiously plundered by their so-called

cratic press -- the city dailies of the nation-- have almost uniformly ignored the matter. Could proof be more convincing of their subserviency to the money power? On the other hand, these newspapers, especially in the eastern and middle states, have resorted to downright misrepresentation and lying on the money question to mislead the reader. If a newspaper will suppress or pervert facts on the money question is it not likely to do so on other questions? The metropolitan press is supported mainly by wage-workers, and if ever a boycott was justifiable it certainly would be so in the case of these exponents of the money power. Workingmen everywhere should not only refuse to read prostituted papers, but they should also refuse to patronize those who advertise in their columns. The time has come when we should make a sharp distinction between friends and enemies. The money power has ruled too long.



representatives. No other people ever felt more keenly the iron hand of corporate and monopoly greed than we do to-day. Had we not lived in the most productive country on earth such wholesale robbery would long ago have exhausted the people's resources. Nearly all government lands desirable for settlement have been disposed of, and still we are actually (not nominally) in debt as much as we were at the close of the war, thirty years ago. Our public servants have given millions away in franchises, and we are still without any means of raising public revenues except taxation. How would any private business be likely to succeed under similar management?

But this is not the worst. Our contributions to corporations have helped create and foster the blood-sucking aggregation which is to-day preying upon the lives of the people. Had we simply been plundered the case would not be so bad, but we have been unmercifully sand-bagged as well.

To sum it up in one sentence: the nation has received as an equivalent for its property more than six hundred trusts and combines which to-day control almost every important industry. The blight of monopoly is everywhere visible. Better, a thousand times better for the masses if the property contributed to many of our corporations and monopolies could have been sunk in the sea!

Our eleventh census report clearly shows that these conditions have been growing steadily worse for more than twenty years, and yet not one distinctive anti-monopoly law has been enacted during all this time. From the reading of the last republican platform one might conclude that there is not a monopoly or combine in the country, as neither word appears in the document. Not one law of importance has been passed in all these years directly in the interest of working-people—but volumes of laws have been passed in the interest of the money power.

I wonder we have escaped revolution so long!

The same influences responsible for twenty years or more of class legislation are again seeking preferment. They ask another lease of life to rob your children's children. Shall we help to rivet the chains of debt on those unable to defend themselves? We are asked to perpetuate this hell in the interest of the money power,—no one else is satisfied with it. Is it the part of patriotism and good citizenship to vote to continue a delegate system that has prostituted its services in the

interest of predatory wealth until the very earth seems to groan with the injustice—until the unrest of the masses certainly presages revolution? Could evidence be more convincing that the fault lies with our political, delegate system? Nature has been lavish with her bounties, but it is well known that the sowers are not the gleaners.

If our political system is at fault why not substitute a system that may possibly be better but cannot be worse? If the great body of the people are yet honest and sincerely desire just and efficient laws,—laws that will rest upon all alike—why not vote to give the poor, over-worked politician a long vacation and let the people try their powers at law-making? But the reader may contend that only free silver and the tariff are the issues. Can we depend on the politicians to settle even these issues? What has been their success in the past? With a gold-standard senate or house what must be the fate of free silver, although the people vote it three to one? We will need a direct system of voting to settle these issues, not to mention the many others even more important.

Now is the time to begin the agitation. In the following pages I endeavor to show why a system of self-government—the “direct rule of the people,” should be adopted at the earliest possible moment, adopted before it is too late.

If every voter who favors such a system would support only candidates pledged to Direct Legislation, the way out of present conditions would be short and simple.

The money power will be solidly opposed to such a change, and every day the present system is continued will make the change more difficult and hazardous.

Friend, think seriously. This issue may involve more of peace and happiness or more of misery and bondage than you apprehend. You are to decide whether we shall continue the rule of the money power through the politicians, or adopt “the rule of the people.”

In the quiet of your home, in the presence of those you love best, decide this issue. In after years may their gratitude be the evidence that your decision was unselfish, just and patriotic.



"Truth does not depend upon majorities, and only asks an impartial, respectful hearing." I am aware that with many whose station in life is attended with innumerable comforts conservatism has in fact become a second nature. With them earnest appeal is fanaticism and vehement protest, anarchy. But will the multitudes of our people, now hovering close to the edge of hopeless poverty and misery, be wise in accepting counsel from this source? My contention is with the present system, with present conditions. I have not intentionally attacked individuals. For this reason I add the following :

#### A WORD OF EXPLANATION.

Allusions to the money power in these pages have no reference to wealth honestly earned or fairly acquired, but to redundant riches amassed through privilege, deception and greed, whether held by an individual or by predatory corporations.

I am not informed of the amount of property acquired by Thomas A. Edison. But be it much or little, every cent he owns has been well and faithfully earned through tireless years of devotion to science for the good of the race. That he should turn to be an avowed socialist is only consistent with such a life of self-sacrifice.

If all men of wealth belonged to the same rank these perilous times would not be. There would not exist the necessity perhaps of throwing about liberty and free government every possible safe-guard. But fortunately for the people Wall and Lombard streets, the bond syndicates and bankers, the mortgage sharks and money-changers have been too defiant. Their arrogance has in some degree aroused the people, and they have begun to ask why, in a young republic like this, the worst conditions in all Europe should now find a parallel. They want to know why there were more evictions in New York city last year than in all of Ireland; why sectionalism has again made its way into politics, dividing the East and the West; why eastern bankers and capitalists are so anxious to inform western workingmen how to vote.

The people are thinking. Hunger is sometimes a stimulus to thought. What may come of it all? Thousands are already tired and disgusted with party-rule and political corruption. The times are ripe, mellow ripe for a change. Let us hope it is the dawn of a brighter day for all who toil.

# THE SWISS METHOD OF DIRECT LEGISLATION.

---

HOW THE PEOPLE CAN MAKE THEIR OWN LAWS.

For several years the eyes of nearly all students of political science, the world over, have been turned toward Switzerland, the ideal republic of the old world.

The liberty-loving Swiss have been making an actual test of perhaps the most important problem in the experiment of free government, namely: the most efficient method for the expression of the popular will. Or, in other words, they have been making a thorough trial of what seems at this time to be the most practical system by which "the rule of the people" can be secured and maintained.

Their discoveries comprise what is now known as Direct Legislation through the Initiative and Referendum.

## WHAT IS THE INITIATIVE?

The Initiative may be defined as an institution by which a certain percentage of the voters can *initiate* or propose laws, say from 5 to 20 per cent.

The Initiative gives the people the power to originate laws. It gives the people the power to compel the legislature to put in form all such laws as they may initiate or demand by a preliminary vote.

The following from a work by W. D. McCracken, A. M., is a plain and concise statement of the Initiative:

"Take any question in the United States in which a body of voters is interested, but which has not yet entered into practical politics, as we say. Under present circumstances how can such a question be brought into the channel of legislation? The most obvious method is by electing a representative who is pledged to lay a bill before the House incorporating the desired reform. But this is no easy matter, even with the backing of many votes, for our electoral system is so contrived that great numbers of voters are practically disfranchised at every election. In fact until some form of propor-

tional representation is adopted, which shall make every vote count for something, and destroy every attempt at gerrymandering, the various groups of earnest reformers can hardly hope to be represented.

But suppose, for an instant, that a representative could be elected on such an issue, there is no certainty that his bill would be even noticed, much less discussed, or that if it were discussed, it would not be promptly tabled, as is so often the case. Two other courses lie open in this country—petition and bribery. Of the second I need only say that, though it may seem a perfectly natural method to the agents of great corporations, it is not likely to commend itself to those who are striving for clean government. The expedient of a petition is frequently resorted to. But the signatures of the sovereign people are rarely treated seriously by politicians. If they could be accompanied by a *direct command* the case would be far different. In Switzerland, however, the introduction into practical politics of any question which has attracted public attention is accomplished in a simple, effectual and direct manner. The Swiss people now enjoy the right of proposing measures themselves, which is called the Initiative, and this method has been wonderfully successful.

Seventeen out of twenty-two cantons have adopted this form of true democracy. In 1891 it was introduced into the provisions for amending the Swiss Federal Constitution. This act marks the greatest advance in the direction of popular sovereignty which has yet been made by any modern nation. The right of the Initiative it must be remembered, is not merely the privilege of petition. It is a constitutional demand by a certain percentage of the population,—not an irregular request, and must be heeded."

#### WHAT IS THE REFERENDUM?

The Referendum is an institution by which all proposed laws are *referred* to the people for final acceptance or rejection.

It is the people's "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not."

It affords every citizen the opportunity at the ballot box to register a "yes" or "no" on every important law by which he is to be governed.

The Referendum has been adopted by every canton of the Swiss Confederation except one. I again quote from "Swiss Solutions of American Problems ;"



"The Referendum is above all things fatal to anything like extravagance in the management of public funds; it descerns instantly and kills remorselessly all manner of jobs, and forbids favors lavished upon one district at the expense of the rest. Nowhere in the world does government display more ability and stability, more simplicity and economy, than in the republic of Switzerland. The educational effect has also been marked. Every voter has found himself obliged to investigate and pass judgment upon bills on their merits, not merely to vote blindly for vague party policies."

It will be seen that the Initiative and Referendum provide a very simple method for "the rule of the people," without the interference of "middlemen." It gives the people a chance to start and stop all laws—a privilege no other form of government has ever allowed. Free government is safe only when the people rule absolutely. Under this method no legislation not in the interest of a majority can become a law.

Under this system the people can propose or initiate laws—the only condition being that a certain percentage of voters must petition for the proposed measure or law. Then when the requisite number have petitioned the proposed law *must be* submitted to the whole body of voters for their rejection or adoption.

#### WHAT IS DIRECT LEGISLATION?

By this method the people vote *direct* on the laws by which they are to be governed, hence it is called Direct Legislation.

This system is not only applicable in township and county affairs, but equally so in municipal, state and national affairs, as the Swiss people have so fully demonstrated during the past twenty years or more.

Local option is but a species of the Referendum. Our present plan of referring state constitutions, and amendments to our Federal constitution, direct to the people for their adoption is practically the Swiss method of direct vote. All that is necessary is to extend this same, century-tried principle to all departments of law-making, and we have made the important change.

On the 11th of February last the legislature of Iowa voted favorably on a bill giving the power to school districts to vote for free text books. This is Direct Legislation through the Referendum on a very small scale. Why should not the peo-

ple have this privilege on all important measures? Not only the right to vote "yes" or "no" on every important measure, but the power as well to propose or initiate new measures? Then we would have absolute *self-rule*. We would then in fact as we are now in name be a self-governing nation. We are now a true democracy in name only.

"*The Imperative Mandate*" should accompany Direct Legislation. It is the power of recalling an officer. It is the people's right to vote out of office at any time men who fail to serve the public or are untrue to their pledges.

### SOME ADVANTAGES OF DIRECT RULE.

There is no longer any doubt in the minds of thoughtful, patriotic voters that some change must be made in our form of government or it will soon be unworthy to be called a republic. The arguments set forth by present conditions are unanswerable. We are rapidly becoming a nation with a moneyed aristocracy on one hand and tenant farmers, day laborers and factory slaves on the other. A New York paper has recently published the names of four thousand three hundred millionaires. The money power—not the people—rule. No republic has ever endured such conditions, and never will.

It remains to be seen whether the American people will be wise enough to adopt a peaceable bloodless change while they yet have the power, or whether we shall drift on to inevitable revolution. This must remain the serious question of our time.

Direct Legislation, through the Initiative and Referendum, in brief possesses the following important advantages over our present so-called representative system:

- 1 The people rule—not nominally but in fact.
- 2 Issues—not candidates are discussed.
- 3 Eliminates party rancor.
- 4 Furnishes an effectual control for monopolies, combines, trusts and corporations.
- 5 Does away with party domination and bossism.
- 6 Gives us peopleism in place of partyism.
- 7 Increases interest in citizenship by increasing the responsibility by direct voting.
- 8 Substitutes stewards for rulers.
- 9 Simplifies government, diminishes its cost.
- 10 The people serve as their own representatives.
- 11 Is a constant means of public education.



- 12 Renders ineffectual "corruption money" in politics.
- 13 Every officer is subject to recall by his constituency.
- 14 Under this system the rights of the weakest and poorest citizen are respected.
- 15 Insures majority rule and minority representation.
- 16 Antagonizes no other reform.
- 17 The Initiative serves for the repeal of bad laws while the Referendum prevents the enactment of bad laws.
- 18 If the people suffer from misrule or from needed legislation under this system they have themselves to blame.
- 19 Aids the adoption of almost every other good reform.
- 20 Prevents power from vesting in officials and legislators.
- 21 Reposes the veto power only with the people.
- 22 Gives permanency to popular rule, and retires the professional politician and office seeker.
- 23 Is a government by the people instead of by politicians.
- 24 To oppose such a system is to oppose popular sovereignty.
- 25 Every meritorious plank in either the republican, democratic, populist or prohibition platforms would be more certain of speedy adoption under this system than under any other system known to the science of government.
- 26 It is a just and fair system, and works no wrong to any section, class or individual; it is neither better nor worse than the people in their collective capacity; it recognizes neither race nor color lines; it sets no limit on custom, morality or religion; it knows neither rich nor poor, high nor low. To use Lincoln's oft-repeated words: "It is of the people, by the people and for the people."

Can as much be said for any other system of government?

### A COMPARATIVE VIEW.

The following is from "The Rise of the Swiss Republic:"

"Both the Initiative and Referendum are mediums for the expression of the popular will, viewed from a different standpoint. The Referendum is a passive force; it says merely "yes" or "no," and is essentially judicial in character. The Initiative, on the other hand, is an active, creative force; it supplies the progressive element in the process of legislation, while the Referendum acts as a critical, controlling check upon the adoption of laws. Taken together these two institutions form the most perfect contrivance so far devised by a free people for the conduct of self-government. They create

a sort of political pendulum which oscillated in a groove strictly marked by the constitution."

### WHAT WE COULD DO WITH DIRECT LEGISLATION.

There are several important reforms that have been advocated for years by good and wise citizens of all parties, which are no nearer adoption to-day, under our present system, than when first proposed.

With the Initiative and Referendum in operation this unnecessary and harrassing delay would have been avoidable. We would not now as for several years past be at the mercy of a lot of fourth-rate politicians who are working us for revenue only.

By this system what could be more just, or in keeping with the principles of a pure democracy than the submission to the people for their "yes" or "no" the following questions:

Do you favor a tariff in excess of the necessary expenses of the government, including present internal revenues?

Do you favor international reciprocity?

Are you in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the present ratio of 16 to 1?

Do you favor a national currency issued by the general government without the intervention of banks which shall be a full legal tender for all debts?

Do you favor an increase of our circulating medium to \$50. per capita?

Do you favor postal savings banks?

Should the government operate the railroads, telegraphs and telephones?

Do you favor a graduated property tax?

Should the government control the alcohol traffic?

Do you favor the exemption from taxation of every home to the value of \$1000?—(an income tax to make up for this loss in revenue.)

Should alien ownership of land be allowed?

Do you favor the taxation of unimproved lands the same as improved?

Should not all public officers be subject to recall?

Should the school education of all children under 12 years of age be compulsory, and public aid given when necessary?

Should United States senators be elected by popular vote?

Do you favor the nationalization of the Standard Oil monopoly and our coal mines?

Should eight hours constitute a lawful day's work?

Should civil service reform be applied to all departments of government?

### **NO MONEY IN THE MOVEMENT.**

There is one prominent feature with the Direct Legislation movement. There is no money in it for any one. It is not a job. There are no fat offices; it means simply to give the people the power they ought to have. Hence jobs will be prevented. The pay of fat offices will be ventilated. Politicians do not like it. They do not say they disapprove of it. That would not do. But they say it is not practicable, or that the people are not ready for it, or they smother it with silence. Whenever you see a well-informed person oppose Direct Legislation, you can be reasonably certain he has some selfish motive in doing so.

### **A BUSINESS PRINCIPLE.**

Does a successful business man employ a person to represent him in any important matter when he feels assured that he can better represent himself?

In matters of government why should we employ a representative when we can be reasonably certain that he will be approached by the money power, either directly or indirectly, and perhaps sell us out, when by the method of Direct Legislation it is possible for us to represent ourselves?

We must constantly bear in mind that conditions have materially changed in recent years. It is a well known fact that we now have the "third house," as the lobby is sometimes called. These new conditions demand new methods, and our present situation ought to be evidence that our legislative machinery is not only badly out of repair, but also out of date. How long must the masses go moneyless and miserable before they come to realize this fact?

If all important questions could be referred directly to a vote of the people for their adoption or rejection, oppression in government — CLASS FAVORITISM — would be impossible. People would not vote the adoption of any oppressive measure, and if they did so they would only have themselves to blame, and would have the same opportunity to repeal obnoxious laws that they had in adopting them.



No nation can reasonably claim to be civilized that is incapable of self-government;—if capable of self-government—it should have the opportunity—it should *demand the right* to govern itself.

### A SYSTEM LONG IN USE.

In deliberative bodies the Initiative and Referendum have long prevailed. A person arises and addresses the chairman: "I move we do this or that thing, etc.," and, after discussion, the body votes on it, the majority deciding.

Under the Initiative, either in national, state, county, township or municipal affairs, a certain agreed number of petitioners express approval of a measure, after which the entire body of voters indorse or reject the measure.

The New England town meetings well illustrate this principle. On a limited scale they afford Direct Legislation in that the measures are discussed and voted on by the people independent of representatives.

What is there impracticable about such a system, except for boodlers, party bosses or professional place-hunters? It would be next to impossible with such a method to thwart the will of the people,—even with the money power entrenched as it is to-day. In all the affairs of men superstition attaches to nothing else so tenaciously as to ideas on money and government. Why, we have hardly outgrown the belief in the "divine right of kings."

When we consider how a few by cunning, sophistry and brute force have always succeeded in subverting the will of the many and in extortions of tribute, is it any wonder that the principle of "direct rule by the people" has been so long delayed?

### DIRECT LEGISLATION IN SWITZERLAND.

Perhaps no individual has labored with more untiring devotion to and with greater success for the Referendum in this country than J. W. Sullivan, of New York. Three years ago Mr. Sullivan made a visit of several months to Switzerland to make a study of her institutions and form of government. His book, "Direct Legislation by the Citizenship, through the Initiative and Referendum," embodies much information, and is considered the standard. It has been the means of making thousands of converts to the most advanced system of gov-

ernment now known to civilization. I quote the following from this work :

“To briefly recount what the Swiss have accomplished by Direct Legislation : They have made it easy at any time to alter their cantonal and Federal constitutions. They have cleared from the way of majority rule every obstacle—privilege of ruler, fetter of ancient law, power of legislator. They have simplified the structure of government, held their officials as servants, rendered bureaucracy impossible, converted their representatives to simple committeemen, and have shown the parliamentary system not essential to law-making. They have written their laws in language so plain that a layman may be judge in the highest court. They have forestalled monopolies, improved and reduced taxation, avoided incurring heavy public debts, and have made a better distribution of their land than any other European country. They have practically given home rule in local affairs to every community. They have calmed disturbing political elements,—the press is purified, the politician disarmed, the civil service well regulated.

Their citizen army of 475,000 sturdy men is perhaps the most efficient in all Europe, and its maintenance costs but \$3,500,000 a year. The Swiss postal system exercises federal supervision over the railroads, express service, telegraphs and telephones, and is one of the best in the world.”

#### GROWTH OF DIRECT LEGISLATION.

According to the statements of Eltweed Pomeroy, the efficient editor of the *Direct Legislation Record*, of Newark, N. J., there are at this writing THIRTY-EIGHT different state platforms which advocate the Initiative and Referendum, and Proportional Representation. There are also more than *three thousand* independent and reform newspapers advocating this new plan of political and industrial salvation.

Almost every trade union in the United States has been outspoken in advocacy of this reform, and many are making practical use of it in their own organizations. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has also indorsed it.

“Direct rule of the people” is advocated by a large number of civic, religious and benevolent societies, both protestant and catholic.



On the other side of the ocean the Social Democratic Party of Germany, The Social Democratic League, of Holland the Labor Party of Belgium, the Socialistic Labor Party, of France as well as the Social Democratic Federation of England, are all working for the Initiative and Referendum. The agitation has also begun in good earnest in both Australia and New Zealand.

Such prominent English papers as the following are advocates of the measure: The London *Spectator*, *The Contemporary Review*, *The National Review*, The London *Daily Chronicle*, *Times* and *Echo* and *The Clarion*.

Every socialist in Europe, almost without exception, is clamoring for Direct Legislation, and this means about half the population, judging from recent election returns.

Perhaps no other political reform ever made so great progress in so short a time. The movement is scarcely more than three years old in the United States, and already a formidable array of books and other literature, bearing on the subject, has been published. It is safe to say that no other issue to-day is regarded with so much importance by honest voters of all parties, for it is a generally admitted fact that Direct Legislation serves as the most practical means for the adoption of all other meritorious reforms. It supplies the simple, practical, political machinery necessary to insure the "rule of the people," and that ought to be sufficient glory for any reform.

---

Among the more recent books on this subject I will mention the following:

The Swiss Republic, by Boyd Winchester.

The Swiss Confederation, by Adams and Cunningham.

Suggestions on Government, by S. E. Moffett.

Swiss Solutions of American Problems, W. D. McCrackan.

The Rise of the Swiss Republic, same author.

Direct Legislation, by the Citizenship, Through the Initiative and Referendum, by J. W. Sullivan.

The Federal Government of Switzerland, by Benard Moses.

State and Federal Government of Switzerland, by John Martin Vincent, Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University.

Bond and Industrial Slavery, by E. A. Twitchell.

The Little Statesman, by J. F. Schulte.

Hail Referendum, the Shortest Way to Democracy, Alex. M. Thompson, London.

The People or the Politician? by R. L. Taylor.

The following well known publications have recently contained able and lengthy discussions on Direct Legislation :

*The Arena*, *The Westminster Review*, *The International Journal*, and *The North American Review*.

Among the metropolitan newspapers that were first to indorse this "reform of reforms" was the *New York Sun* and the *Denver News*.

---

The Direct Legislation National Conference, which met in St. Louis, July 22, 1896, was called by ten thousand representative citizens, many of whom are prominent reformers and sociologists, and from almost every State and Territory in the Union. The list of vice-presidents comprised such well-known economists as Henry George, Postmaster-General Wilson, ex-Postmaster-General Wannamaker, Henry D. Lloyd, Wm. P. St. John, B. O. Flower, Wm. J. Bryan, W. H. Harvey, and others.

This conference resulted in the permanent organization of a Direct Legislation National League. It decided that a State League be organized at once in every State and Territory, and that the work be pushed rapidly.

The Populist convention, which met in St. Louis the same date, is the first national convention outside of Switzerland to adopt Direct Legislation. It marks the most advanced step ever taken on American soil by any national gathering in the direction of pure democracy.

Hon. Wm. J. Bryan, the nominee of three conventions for president, is one of the pioneer advocates of Direct Legislation. He was selected by the New Jersey Direct Legislation League, and the Nebraska delegation to urge the adoption of a Direct-Legislation plank in the National Democratic convention platform at Chicago.

#### SOME ADVOCATES OF THE NEW REFORM.

It is safe to say that the most advanced and progressive thinkers, the world over, are to-day in favor of "the rule of the people." The list is so extended that I will attempt, in a brief work of this kind, to give but a few representative

names. Many of these names are known to millions of our people as honest, sincere reformers, and represent almost every shade of religious, social and political belief :

John Clark Ridpath, LL D.,  
 Judge Albion W. Tourgee,  
 B. O. Flower,  
 T. V. Powderly,  
 Samuel Gompers,  
 Gov. John P. Altgeld,  
 Mayor Hazen S. Pingree,  
 Mayor Sutro,  
 Henry D. Lloyd,  
 Clarence S. Darrow,  
 David Ward Wood,  
 Ignatius Donnelly,  
 William Morris,  
 John Burns  
 J. Keir Hardie  
 Ex-Gov. Larrabee,  
 W. H. Harvey,  
 Jane Addams,  
 Milton George,  
 Judge Goggin,  
 President George A. Gates,  
 Gen. J. B. Weaver,  
 Robert Holliway,  
 Congressman Howard,  
 Edward Bellamy,  
 Henry George,  
 Judge Henry Caldwell,  
 Judge Pentecost,  
 Ex-Gov. Fishback,  
 John Swinton,  
 Hon. Thomas McEwan, Jr.,  
 Hon. George L. Smith,  
 Gov. John W. Griggs,  
 Ex-Gov. David H. Waite,  
 Hon. R. W. Irwin,  
 Prof. Edward W. Bemis,  
 Senator Tillman,  
 Judge McConnell,  
 Senator Pepper,  
 Senator Marion Butler,  
 Hon. J. R. Rogers,  
 Rev. Myron W. Reed,  
 S. S. King,  
 Mayor Samuel M. Jones,  
 R. L. Taylor,  
 Prof. James Rodes Buchanan,  
 Prof. Frank Parsons,

Editor J. A. Wayland,  
 Jesse Cox,  
 Mrs. Mary E. Lease,  
 Thomas J. Morgan,  
 Edwin D. Mead,  
 Hon. Henry Winn,  
 W. H. Bennington,  
 Samuel J. Sloan,  
 Rev. Hiram Vrooman,  
 Editor Sheridan Webster,  
 Henry R. Legate,  
 Dr. Emil G. Hirsch,  
 John Willcox,  
 Nelson O. McClees,  
 Dr. Charles J. Lewis,  
 Otto Thum,  
 Dr. Rusk,  
 President Charles W. Eliot,  
 Judge B. J. Peters,  
 Rev. Myron Haynes,  
 Walter Brenn,  
 George P. Keeney,  
 Dr. Schuyler Champion,  
 Judge Quincy,  
 Frankin M. Sprague,  
 John J. McGrath,  
 Editor Eltwed Pomeroy,  
 Dr. Bayard Holmes,  
 Matilda Joslyn Gage,  
 Ex-Gov. Pennoyer,  
 Dr. J. H. Acton,  
 Senator Mitchell,  
 J. J. Ryan,  
 Frank Crane,  
 W. C. Pomeroy,  
 Robert Lindblom,  
 Prof. John R. Commons,  
 Rev. B. Fay Mills,  
 Lord Salisbury,  
 W. H. H. Lecky,  
 Sir Wilfrid Laurier,  
 Hon. Arthur J. Balfour,  
 Lord Rosebery,  
 George Fred Williams,  
 Rev. Alexander Kent,  
 Hon. R. F. Pettigrew,  
 Col. David B. Henderson,



Gov. Horace Boies,  
Prof. George D. Herron,  
Hon. William J. Bryan,  
Helen Campbell,  
Gov. Holcomb,  
Senator Allen,  
Congressman Kerr,  
Col. Augustus Jacobson,  
Moses Harman,  
Thomas A. Edison,  
William Stead,  
W. H. Van Ornum,  
William Blatchford,  
Senator W. S. Vandenburg,  
Gov. Matthews,  
Gen. Paul Vondervoort,  
Dr. Edward McGlynn,  
Samuel Putnam,  
Robert G. Schilling,  
J. F. Willitts,  
Dr. Alice B. Stockham,  
Thaddeus B. Wakeman.  
Thomas V. Cator,  
Edward Evans,  
Senator Teller,  
A. M. Todd,  
Tom Watson,  
S. F. Norton,  
A. S. Edwards,  
Edward L. Lindholm,  
Postmaster-General Wilson,  
H. B. Martin,  
Rev. D. Oglesby,  
A. L. Maxwell,  
Alonzo Wardal,  
Prof. R. T. Ely,  
B. F. Underwood,  
Rev. H. W. Thomas,

Hon. J. Warner Mills,  
Mrs. Helen Gougar,  
Rev. E. P. Wise,  
Margaret Holmes Bates,  
Casca St. John,  
Eugene V. Debs,  
Prof. Thomas E. Hill,  
Senator Wm. M. Stewart,  
Mrs. M. A. Freeman,  
J. F. Adams,  
Ed. E. Chamberlain,  
C. H. McClure,  
Florence E. Kelly,  
Dr. Lyman J. Abbott,  
Rev. Washington Gladden, D. D.,  
Elizabeth Cady Stanton,  
Frances E. Willard,  
Ex-Postmaster-Gen. Wanamaker,  
Charles Dudley Warner,  
Lyman Trumbull,  
Prof. Copeland,  
W. D. Howells,  
Col. Robert G. Ingersoll,  
Justice Walter Clark, LL. D.,  
Charles X. Mathews,  
Rev. James H. Lathrop,  
Dr. C. F. Taylor,  
Morrison B. Swift,  
W. T. Wallace,  
Helen H. Gardner,  
William P. St. John,  
F. J. Eddy,  
W. S. U'Ren,  
George H. Strobell,  
J. W. Sullivan,  
Dr. E. B. Foote,  
Alfred W. Westrup,  
Ex-Gov. John P. St. John.

### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SELF GOVERNMENT.

The Declaration of Independence is said to be the first general enunciation in the world's history of the principle of self-government.

The nearest approach to an ideal government must be when an intelligent people absolutely rule themselves, and the evolution of free government has undeniably been along this line.

Direct Legislation is to-day the most practical known

method for carrying out the idea of popular sovereignty. It supplies every necessary arrangement for absolute rule by the people, without interference of any outside authority.

It is the long-sought principle in the science of government which has been denied the people of the old world by the force of a mob of plunderers and self-appointed rulers.

In our republic the principle of direct self-rule has not been adopted for the reason that our representative system was reasonably successful until the money power began its crusade of corruption and debauchery to influence legislation in its own interests. So long as we have this comparatively new element in politics to contend with can any well-informed person honestly claim that it is as likely for the people to secure and maintain their rights through a system of representation as through a system of direct voting, or self-representation?

While it is not uncommon to influence the voting in a legislature or in our congress, it is practically impossible for the money power to control the whole people. As Abraham Lincoln said: "You can trust all the people a great deal more than you can trust some of the people."

It is a well substantiated fact that people have not been allowed in many ways the exercise of their rights under our so-called representative system; why should they expect to regain them through the same faulty, money-controlled system?

When I hear a person contend (which is very seldom) that the people could not rule themselves as well as the politicians have ruled them, I invariably find that such a person has an eye on some office, or is enjoying some advantage which he has reason to fear will be done away with under popular rule.

Distrust the man who distrusts the people, and do not accept pomposity for argument from those who have a selfish interest in maintaining present conditions. Direct Legislation has come in time, if given a chance, to save the leading republic of the new world. The duty of the hour is plain.

### **BEST METHOD FOR MUNICIPAL CONTROL.**

It is a fact that no well-informed person will attempt to deny that the city government of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and others of our large cities, is notoriously corrupt.

Only a short time ago it is said Charles Yerkes made the



statement that he would not accept twenty-five million dollars for the franchises presented to him by the city of Chicago, through her "boodle aldermen." Not one city of importance in the United States controls its own franchises, while in England at least forty-three do so. It would seem from this record that although our "city folk" may not have so much as one hay-seed in their hair, after all they haven't sense enough to rule themselves and keep the corporations off their necks. The city of Glasgow enjoys a better street-car service than either New York or Chicago, and has a two-cent fare.

Millions for corporations, but the dear people must not be indulged in anything that even savors of public control or ownership;—it would be dangerous—to corporations. Of all that has been given away in franchises the city of Chicago is to-day without any means of raising revenues except taxation. Is it not about time to ring in a change? Otherwise the people may soon have to pay for the privilege of walking on the streets of the corporations.

Duluth, Minn., is the first city in the United States to make a practical test of the Referendum, as far as I am informed. I give a brief account of her experience in the hope that the reader may use his influence to compel every other city to pursue a similar course in the interest of *all* the people :

In Minnesota, cities cannot issue bonds or levy taxes beyond a certain amount unless submitted to and approved by the people. The water supply of Duluth was owned by a private company, and the service was not satisfactory. A year ago the water company offered to sell its plant for \$1,856,000.

It ended by four propositions being submitted to the people. The two principal newspapers took opposite sides. The matter was discussed with great fullness. The political parties did not take sides. Men of all parties served on the committees. Although the unanswered and apparently well-proved charge was made that the plant had not cost the company stockholders a tenth of the amount they asked, the personalities in the discussion were few. It was mainly of facts, methods and policy, and was very educational.

The propositions were : first, to issue bonds for \$1,856,000 to buy or build a water plant; second, to purchase the existing plant; third, to build ; fourth, to issue \$850,000 of bonds to improve existing plant, should the second proposition be car-

ried. The first and third propositions were carried and the second and fourth defeated ; the vote stood about 3 to 1 in favor of building a new plant.

The *Duluth News-Tribune*, which favored buying and opposed building, said : " No loud disputes, and no bitter words were, as a rule, heard during election day. The campaign leaders were content to rest on their laurels as stump speakers, and the rest of the people were content to sustain their reputations as quiet, orderly citizens."

The *Duluth Herald*, which opposed buying and favored building, said ; " It was the largest vote ever poled at a special election in Duluth. The strong arguments in favor of building an independent plant, and against the attempt to foist the company's plant upon the city at an exorbitant price, were all powerful."

It will be seen that this election was a campaign of education, but without party rancor or mud-slinging ; there were no charges of corruption ; the will of the people was definitely and clearly shown, and was promptly acquiesced in by both sides.

Will the reader contrast this popular decision of a large city with the methods generally carried into practice in the administration of city affairs both in New York and Chicago ? The difference between civilization and barbarism is scarcely more marked. Think of an alderman paying \$25000 in election expenses, for the privilege of fleecing the public,—and even at this figure making a profitable deal ? Think of it—and the headquarters of nearly all our foreign mission societies are located in these two cities !

Direct Legislation at once furnishes the solution to the vexed problem of municipal government. If such a method could be adopted how soon the reign of the boodler would cease. Municipal corruption would no longer disgrace the nation.

The recent vote in Chicago on the Torrens Title Registry System was the Referendum in practical use. Why should not the granting of every franchise be submitted to the people in the same manner ?

If the Civic Federation could have had the good judgment to work along this line—giving the people a voice in the disposal of their own property—how much more they could have

accomplished with the same effort. The charge could not then have reasonably been made that this organization is only an annex to the political machine—the same contrivance, whether run by one party or the other, or both—that has for so many years been grinding away regardless of public interest or even common decency.

Now, what shall we think of either newspapers or individuals who will support this “boodle system” in preference to the Referendum? The public should expect to be fleeced so long as it supports fleecers.

Will the metropolitan dailies advocate the cause of the people, or will they continue to advocate the cause of corrupt, municipal politics? Let the people begin the agitation now. Hold meetings, and your Civic Federation, if it is sincere in its pledges of loyalty to the people, will turn its influence for the Referendum. The people’s cause will then soon become the popular cause, and the business of the franchise giver will no longer inflict a patient and long-suffering people.

Detroit, under the gallant leadership of Mayor Hazen S. Pingree, (also candidate for governor of Michigan,) has made a very creditable fight against corporate rule, and Milwaukee has shown considerable resistance of late against the corporate strangulation process, now too common in nearly all American cities. As usual the daily newspapers are on the side of the money power in both of these cities. You know the remedy?

#### **WANT OF CONFIDENCE IN THE SYSTEM.**

If the reader has never tried this experiment it will be found an interesting pastime: make inquiry of your business acquaintances whether they have confidence in our so-called representative system, and if they believe in the honesty of politicians? The test may surprise you.

You will find that not one out of a dozen will express confidence and satisfaction in the present system.

This deplorable change is the result of nearly a quarter of a century of class legislation. Want of public confidence in the honest and just administration of the law is always a serious matter, and so far as I know has preceeded and heralded every revolution and down-fall in government. May our unfortunate condition be a happy exception.



It has been charged that we have an "elective despotism." "All power," says Benjamin Rush, "is derived from the people. They possess it only on the days of election. After that it is the property of their rulers." The rulers of course use it as their property; they have paid for it in their election expenses and work, and why should they not use it and sell it for the best price?—and they do.

Some one has said that the government of Russia is a despotism tempered by assassination. Our government seems to be an elective despotism tempered by frequent elections of despots with no power of recall. In this connection Eltwed Pomeroy has well expressed this idea:

"Reformers may win some temporary or small concession, but they cannot secure any thorough and lasting reform on any line while we have rulers over us who are human and susceptible of being bought. You have tried it, keep on trying it till you are convinced that even your own party leaders will fail you when put to the extreme test. Put your trust in the common people. You have gone from one party to another and have believed their promises. Have they fulfilled them? Why be at the mercy of any clique or party? Educate the people up to the reform of Direct Legislation, and you will find that it will not be 'wrung back from you by some silent and unnoticed power,' but it will be permanent and abiding because you have the whole people behind it."

Direct Legislation would purify government and restore general confidence in its administration.

#### ISSUES, NOT PARTY FEALTY.

I take the following from S. E. Moffett's very able book, "Suggestions on Government." Mr. Moffett is the editor of the San Francisco *Examiner*:

"Suppose, for instance, that my ideas of a national "policy" quantitatively expressed, run like this:

Tariff reform	-	-	-	-	100
Favorable to free silver coinage	-	-	-	-	99
Economy in government	-	-	-	-	80
Favorable to postal savings banks	-	-	-	-	50
Extention of civil service laws	-	-	-	-	50
Government control of railroads	-	-	-	-	40
Total	-	-	-	-	419



Suppose that one party meets my wishes on tariff reform and economy (180) and the other party on silver, postal banks and government control of railroads (189), while neither takes a satisfactory position on civil service (50). Then if I vote for my party, I vote for a policy of which I approve of only 180 parts and disapprove of 239; and if I vote for the other, I vote for a policy of which I approve of only 189 parts and disapprove of 230. Thus my net satisfaction is 59 less than nothing in one case and 41 less than nothing in the other. And moreover, the situation is almost certain to be still further complicated by the nomination of candidates whom I do not consider fit to hold office, but for whom I must vote as the only way of exerting an influence on the choice of any policy at all. If the people were allowed to vote *on measures* as well as on men, I could exert my full power at the polls in favor of the whole 419 points of the policy I desired to see carried out, and in addition, I could vote for the candidate I thought best qualified for legislative business, regardless of his opinions on disputed political issues."

#### PARTYISM RESTRAINS INTELLIGENT ACTION.

Under a direct system of voting, political parties will be discontinued, as has been the case in Switzerland. Independent, intelligent action on the the part of the voter will make them unnecessary.

I for one have lost all confidence in political parties and party newspapers. There is no depth of infamy to which both will not descend to gain some party advantage, which may be opposed to the interest of the people. Again and again we have seen these influences, especially in cities, become the dupes of the money power—the "gold ring." We have seen the most disreputable characters transformed into party bosses, and candidates selected with no other qualification on earth but their ability to contribute to the campaign fund. We have seen so many corporation lawyers sent to the senate—by their corporations, that the anomalous spectacle no longer arouses public indifference.

We have tried the expedient of political parties—and with what success? Let *present conditions be the answer!*

Is it even likely or possible for any real improvement to come under the domination of any party so long as we remain

at the mercy of representatives who are susceptible of influence by the money power? But the reader may resent this imputation of dishonesty and disloyalty on the part of our so-called representatives. Is more conclusive proof demanded than that furnished by the history of legislation for the past twenty years—both state and national?

From this time forth I expect to fight for the opportunity *to represent myself*. If I was in Cuba I would be an insurgent, and a nihilist if I was in Russia. Any individual who will make no effort to better his condition—to enjoy at least some of the advantages and luxuries of modern life—is not entitled to the respect and consideration due an American voter.

I want to see a political system inaugurated in which measures—not men—will be discussed; in which party rancor and corruption will be but an unpleasant recollection. I want to see independent, political action take the place of partisan prejudice and bigotry. I desire to help bequeath a political system to posterity that will reflect something of intelligence, manhood and honesty; that will at least possess the rudiments of justice and fair play. I want it truthfully said that in the leading republic of the new world the law is the will of the people.

Reader, let us mutually pledge ourselves that we will never knowingly vote again for any candidate for any office who is not fully committed to Direct Legislation?

### THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION.

The campaign of 1896 will be pronounced the greatest political monstrosity of our time.

The people in their collective capacity are utterly powerless to vote their preferences at the polls. I mean by this that it is impossible for a citizen in this campaign to vote for the measures he would like to see enacted into law.

The voter may believe in a high tariff, free coinage of silver, an income tax, government control of the alcohol traffic, postal savings banks, and other questions which no political party to-day advocates. In fact there is no political party that does not advocate some one or more measures to which many voters will object, and no platform contains all the reforms the voter may deem expedient and important of adoption at this time.

Then who believes in the promises of political parties?—Surely not any well-informed voter. We know also that candidates—not measures—are, in too many instances, the subjects of discussion. The personnel of candidates would be a secondary matter if voters were assured that party pledges would be faithfully carried out. But the whole matter turns on the question of the individual honesty of the candidates.

Now, why should we support a system that depends for its usefulness to the people on the common honesty of a few politicians? Isn't that a point of sufficient weakness in the system to justify its disuse?

Our present system virtually compels a citizen to vote his indorsement of a mass of party clap-trap in order to register his wish on only one or two planks of the platform, the balance of which he does not indorse. There are now *six* parties; each one may be contending for someone or more reforms we indorse, and will not be able to vote on because it is not included in the platform of the party to which we will give our vote. So, in any case, we are deprived of our full vote—disfranchised that far.

The reader must see from this situation how defective our political system is—if indeed it can properly be called a system,—leaving entirely out of consideration the influences we know are brought to bear to favor the classes against the masses. How much in advance of such a system is the Swiss method of Direct Legislation which allows the citizen to vote for any measure or measures properly initiated by the voters themselves, regardless of either party or candidates.

When we take into account the fact that our representatives are quite likely to utterly ignore the wishes of their constituency when thoroughly installed in office, then we cannot fail to see what “a howling farce, played to the galleries,” our so-called representative system is.

Would not the people be better off without any representation if legislation is to be conducted in the future as in the past—if the people's interests are simply to be made a matter of barter by their elected delegates?

Is it reasonable to support a political system that has proven to be almost thoroughly worthless since the advent of the money power—that possesses scarcely one redeeming feature? Why do we vote to deprive the people of self-rule?



Reader, you are doing this when you cast your vote for any candidate not pledged to Direct Legislation.

Is it not actually treason to vote to keep the people under a political representative system that principally represents corporations and monopolies? Slaves to party, or those who may be reaping advantage from the present system, may pretend to see no injustice in such a course. But is it not time to stop and consider the consequences of our acts? What kind of a political inheritance are we leaving our children?—bonds and bondage. What will be the verdict of history if this system continues? Will it not designate this as the “easy age?” Can we afford to allow this farce to continue?

### THE MIDDLEMAN IN POLITICS.

Eltweed Pomeroy has well said: “We have done away with the middleman in religion. A man can worship as he pleases (except in Tennessee). We have done away with the middleman in intellectual life; a man can think as he pleases, and in most cases, read what he pleases. We have done away with the middleman in politics to a certain extent only. The people themselves must have the final say on all laws which are to govern them, then will the people have complete self-government.”

Mr. Pomeroy, in the course of a lengthy magazine article, says further under this head:

“The path has been blazed in this country by the New England town-meeting; by the method of ratifying the fundamental law of the land, the national and state constitutions; by many thousands of local Referendums; by the experience of the trade unions. The path has been made plain and straight and buttressed by the experience of the model republic of the old world, mountain-pierced, freedom-saturated Switzerland.

The principle at the bottom of this is that a suitable minority of the people may demand that any law passed by the law-making body shall be referred to a poll of the people interested, and also that a suitable minority of the people may initiate any law for their governance which, after fit discussion, shall go to a poll of the whole people interested, and their decision shall, in both cases, be final.

The first is called the Referendum, referring to the people;



the second, the initiative, the starting of a law. The Referendum is negative, preventive; the initiative is positive, constructive. The two together constitute Direct Legislation in distinction to our present system of indirect legislation, where the people give the complete control of legislation to men selected nominally by the people, but really by party managers. Through Direct Legislation the people can have the complete and constant control of the making of laws which govern them. This is self-government. It is the necessary step toward larger social and economic freedom.

At present the state legislatures may impose on a city or locality any new charter or law they see fit. Under Direct Legislation, any locality alone could veto any measure passed by the legislature which applied to it alone. It could make for itself laws which it needs to govern itself. This means complete local self-government. It is full adherence to the wise saying: 'Where the law is administered there it should be made.'

Hence, the first step toward the freedom of the nation, the state, the locality, the individual, is the complete autonomy of each division of the body politic, from the nation down to the smallest locality and the individual, to be obtained through Direct Legislation. Complete local self-government thus and thus only is obtainable. By it the people's will can easily be found and quickly and surely embodied into law.

A century ago the statement of grand principles enchained the people. We have learned much in a century. Among other things we have learned that would-be rulers often state grand and glorious principles before they are elected, and when elected, they fail almost as often to carry them out.

Direct Legislation is the method of doing away with rulers and getting servants in their place; of getting self-government and not government by others—even if nominally chosen from our midst; of getting true freedom in government. It can be applied to the smallest hamlet or the mightiest nation. So let us insist on this method, this first step toward a truer and nobler freedom, a grander and more glorious Liberty."

#### HOW CAN WE SECURE DIRECT LEGISLATION?

The advocates of Direct Legislation in Kansas are circulating pledges, which is a most excellent plan of propaganda.

Every reformer should refuse to vote for any candidate, even on his own ticket, who is not favorable to Direct Legislation, for it is the basis of a truly free government. The Kansas pledge is printed on a card, and worded as follows :

PLEDGE OF THE DIRECT LEGISLATION LEAGUE, OF KANSAS.

No. ....

Date .....

*If the candidate of my party for State Senator or Representative refuses to publically pledge himself, that if elected, he will vote for the submission of the question of Direct Legislation (as an amendment to the State Constitution) to a direct vote of the people, then I pledge myself for the candidate of any other party who will so pledge himself*

H. F. NOLTE, Republican, *President*.

R. LINDENBERGER, Democrat, *Vice Pres.*

CHAS. D. HILLABOLD, Populist, *Secretary*.

Name ..... P. O. ....

On the reverse side of the pledge-card is printed the constitution of the League. Object: "The adoption of the system of Direct Legislation as embodied in the Initiative and Referendum and Imperative Mandate in the law-making of the State of Kansas."

Then follows some brief statements relating to "membership," "dues," "officers," and "duties of officers." There are no salaried officers, and the expenses are to be met by voluntary contributions. No two officers are to be of the same political party, which is a good provision. The Kansas plan is certainly a good one, and should be adopted in every State and Territory.

In voting for members of congress it is equally important that they shall be pledged to Direct Legislation. See that no candidate for congress receives your vote who is unwilling for you to have the opportunity to register a "no" or "yes" on every important measure. Any candidate unwilling to grant every voter this right gives what ought to be conclusive proof that he is not a fit person to be intrusted with public interests. I will put it in another way: such a candidate furnishes the proof that he is neither a true republican, democrat, populist nor prohibitionist,—he is simply a demagogue who does not

believe in a true democracy, and should go straight to Russia where he belongs.

Your local editors should be able and willing to give the pledges of all candidates on your ticket. The candidate that will make no pledges—especially for congress—should certainly be turned down, and his party affiliations should make no difference—he is unworthy of suffrage.

### FAVORITISM IN GOVERNMENT.

When we think how the people for centuries have been imposed upon by their rulers ; have been dragged into battle ; have famished in dungeons and prisons ; have lived in squalor and poverty all their life-times, simply that a few might live in idleness and dissipation—and laugh at the folly of the fools they ruled—it is not surprising that the principle of “self-rule by the people” should have failed of adoption until the close of the nineteenth century.

The abuse of power has always been by the few—never by the many. The effort of the few has always been to subjugate the will of the many for purposes of tribute and extortion. The people have become accustomed to this order of things so long that many consider all governments possess but three functions,—the power to *tax, punish and restrain*. That governments might be made helpful in securing and maintaining just and humane conditions—might be made to serve the masses as well as the classes—seems a trifle modern.

Power and advantage are never voluntarily surrendered. The reader will no doubt see many illustrations of this fact in the adoption of this reform. “The direct rule of the people” will be opposed by nearly all who are reaping advantage from the present rule of the politicians and the money power. Every form of oppression invariably struggles long and dies hard. This will be no exception.

The working people—the wage slaves—are becoming prostrate at the feet of political and economic oppression to-day. Our middle classes are struggling under a load of debt and unfavorable conditions which must eventually bring them to the same miserable end. Senator Tillman recently said: “This country is going to hell.”—Is it not already there?

I see but one hope—“THE RULE OF THE PEOPLE.”

Complete self-government can break the jaws of corporate



and monopoly greed, and drive forever from our shores the vampires of extortion and privilege.

Shall we be serfs or masters of the situation? Shall we be narrow partisans and finally sacrifice all; or patriotic freemen, and stand for the welfare of the great, common people?

### WHY THE PRESENT SYSTEM WILL NOT DO.

We must not forget that during the past twenty years many new conditions have arisen. Our rapid increase in population, the centralization of wealth, as well as other conditions, have forced new questions upon us for settlement. I hold that our present political machinery is no more adequate to meet these new demands than is the hand-rake harvester of twenty years ago to fill the requirements of the modern steel binder.

Take for example the one condition of machinery-displaced labor. We know that countless labor-saving devices are turning thousands adrift every week on the labor market, and the demand for labor is decreasing in proportion to our increase in population. The sources for employment upon which workmen have always depended are failing us—a condition no other age has known. If the means of earning a living are being curtailed and gradually narrowed down it must be evident we will soon have an enormous and permanent army of unemployed—in fact we have it now.

This condition gives rise to another serious question: if society withholds from a portion of the people (for virtually that is what it does) the means of a living it is equivalent to a denial of the right to live. Hence it would appear there is no longer room on the earth for the moneyless man—at least on any portion of it under plutocratic rule. In thousands of cases the enforced idler cannot get work. He can't live and he can't die. He must not beg and he must not steal.—Think of such conditions in the midst of abundance! —is it any wonder that hell is losing its terrors?

What prospect is there that under our present system these problems will even be manfully met—to say nothing of being solved? But nothing can be more certain than this fact: *these questions must be solved if our government endures.* Force may do for a time; but it will at last fail as it has always failed. A hungry man in any country is a desperate man—a dan-



gerous man. Extreme wealth invariably rests beneath the outstretched arm of force.—“From Moscow to Alexandria,” says Henry D. Lloyd, “every step of the way is strewn with the graves of those who have tried to solve the problem of government by force.”

The centralization of capital is another danger our present system has done everything to intensify and nothing to ameliorate. One per cent. of our population now controls more property than the remaining ninety-nine per cent,—the classes becoming richer, the masses becoming poorer. The present system is utterly powerless to right these conditions—in fact the majority of those who defend the present system, and are reaping advantage from its inequalities affirm that it is “God-ordained.” Slavery was also God-ordained, and every form of oppression since the world began has found its defenders among the rich and their lackies.

Again, is our present system efficient for the control of the monopolies, trusts, combines and corporations which are already masters in almost every important industry? Is it not a fact that these industrial vampires were nurtured into life under the fostering care of our dominant political parties? To be still more explicit, are not these essentials of wealth really the unwelcome off-spring of the republican party?—In all the years this party was in full control of congress what action was ever taken to protect public interests against syndicate greed and extortion?—*absolutely none.*

The democratic party can take to itself no credit for its record on anti-monopoly legislation. Its present national platform is perhaps the strongest declaration on this subject ever made by this party, while the republican platform as usual entirely ignores the whole matter. But this party could not do otherwise, the wealth that controls it would not permit.

Then we have the problem of taxation. Will any one claim that wealth is paying a fair and just proportion of the taxes, or has ever done so? The decision on the income tax law ought to serve as proof of the utter inefficiency of our present legislative methods in the interest of the people.

We have not yet attempted any solution of the race problem. Turn as we may we have continually to face the disagreeable fact that more than one-tenth of our population is colored, and about seven millions of these people are scarcely

able to read and write, and are increasing with the characteristic fecundity of some of the lower animals. To our shame and disgrace what has been done for these millions except turn them loose out of slavery like a lot of cattle? What is likely to be done—what can be done—under the present system to avert the racial difficulties that are almost certain to arise in the near future?

To-day we number at least seventy million people, naturally industrious, contented and frugal, occupying the most productive country on earth, and not one out of a dozen is satisfied with the way things are going, and not one out of a dozen has confidence in the honest administration of law or in those who make a profession of politics. Is it possible for words to convey a more scathing denunciation of a political system than do these facts?

The destruction of public confidence in government—I care not by what means brought about—is a sure sign of impending danger, and it is a matter that every good citizen will seriously consider.

This general want of confidence in our delegate system, in the honesty of politicians and parties, as I have stated on a preceeding page, is the natural outgrowth of party perfidy and disloyalty through a long term of years. It is not the growth of a short time. There is no question that the influence of wealth has in some way brought about this deplorable result. Be that as it may, our duty is to right the matter as quickly and as thoroughly as possible.

What is to be done? Shall we vote to continue the present system when there is every indication that a crisis must come sooner or later? Why delay, when millions of our number are already discouraged, disheartened, hungry and wretched? Haven't we been in hell long enough? Shall we wait till the bondage of poverty drives from the homes of our workingmen the last vestige of hope, and rivets the accursed chains of debt upon our children's children?

Vote the change *now*—it may be too late to-morrow.

#### **PARTY PREJUDICE A SIGN OF IGNORANCE.**

We know absolutely that nearly all the want, misery and wretchedness we see on every hand to-day come from artificial conditions—not from natural causes, yet we have not the courage to say so and vote a change.

We go moneyless and shabbily dressed, and work long hours, see wife and children in want, then vote to keep the money power and politicians astride our necks. It seems that we prefer to hug and kiss our chains;—would it not serve us right if our children in their honest indignation—robbed of proper support and education—would sometimes kick us out, chains and all?

But do we deserve anything better so long as we remain the dupes and serfs of selfish and unreasoning conservatism? Is not an empty stomach good enough for any voter who will not put aside party prejudice in the consideration of political questions?

I have respect for every honest and sincere voter of whatever party, however much he may differ from me. But for any person who will not do his own thinking on all subjects, and act on his honest convictions; who will not try to possess the inner-most kernel of truth regardless of what may seem the most generally accepted theories—for such I have only a kind of pity that almost borders on contempt. And what shall I say of the voter, in these degenerate political days, who will fill up on the pabulum of a single partisan newspaper, and try to pass himself off as well posted in politics?

I sometimes think the influence exerted by nearly all distinctive partisan newspapers is so narrow as to be positively detrimental to the proper exercise of intelligent citizenship. For this reason alone Direct Legislation should be welcomed by all good people. The thoroughly partisan newspaper cultivates prejudice and bigotry, and party rancor is a natural result. If all our newspapers, in both city and country, could be honestly independent, could discuss measures untrammelled by party interest or domination, as is the case in Switzerland, how much better—ininitely better—it would be for the people.

Let us not forget that *partyism* is oftentimes unreasonable and actually dangerous. Rome fell through the quarrels of the plebeians and the patricians. Wealth in every age and country has attempted to divide the people, and keep them divided. Greece was riven and shattered by the strife of the partisans of Athens and Sparta. Byzantium's streets ran with blood over a conflict between the Greens and the Blues, incited by a jockey contest. Party bickerings and rancor always detract attention from the important issues in every campaign. This is invariably to the advantage of wealth.



An unthinking, prejudiced voter is a disgrace to any party. There is no security for free government that is not grounded upon intelligent suffrage. The money power would never have gained such supremacy had all voters as well as all representatives been honest and independent.

Direct Legislation is purely an unpartisan issue. It appeals to all voters who are more interested in good government than in mere party success. It furnishes the true test of intelligent, honest, unprejudiced citizenship.

The Colonial congress of 1774 resolved that "The foundation of all free government is the right in the people to participate in their legislative council." Do they in truth do so now?—since when?

### LET US NOT DECEIVE OURSELVES.

"A government by the people," says a writer in *The Coming Nation*, "is a dream yet to be realized. Instead of being democratically governed we are under the domination of political bureaucracies that plunder and rob the people. Jobbers in politics through deceiving the people, have procured an increasing centralization of political power which is being used for the material profit of privileged classes. Not centralization, but diffusion of power is the safety of the present."

Unfortunately politicians are not honest, at the most but few of them, and the few exceptions prove the rule. They care more for their own interests than for the interests of the people. So they will naturally oppose "direct rule by the people."

Webster once said of the professional politician: "He is primarily devoted to his own advancement in public office; a schemer, an intriguer—cunning, politic and artful." If it were possible to adopt a political system that would transform the politician into a mere committeeman would such a change be a public calamity—it probably would be in the eyes of the politician.

Have we not seen enough of a system that depends entirely for its efficiency on the honesty and ability of the politician?

Now a word in regard to political parties—simply to pander to the taste of some of our party-worshippers: John Clark Ridpath, the world-known author of school histories, and who is neither a partisan nor politician, has written these facts;



"Our political parties differ from one another only in the degree of their subserviency to the money power. It always comes to this in the last stage of partisan degradation. Our political parties to-day fawn around the money power just as they fawned around the knees of the slave oligarchy in the anti-bellum days."

Has history recorded one instance of the abuse of power vested in the people? On the other hand, has not every revolution sprung from the centralization of wealth and power in the hands of a few? Why should we hesitate to vote to change a system that is certainly working to perfection in this dangerous trend?

### IS POLITICAL REFORM NECESSARY?

The people are coming more and more to realize the vast difference between a representative democracy and a social democracy.

The United States has enjoyed the proud distinction of being the pattern in self-government for nearly all other nations. But the Republic of Switzerland has far out-stripped us in applied political science. We are no longer an example of direct democracy. Political equality with us is a mere figure of speech. Our much vaunted representative system belies its very name—it does not represent.

Prof. George D. Harron, of Iowa College, says in his new book, "The Christian State": "We do not select the representatives we elect; We do not make our laws; we do not govern ourselves. Our political parties are controlled by private, close corporations that exist as parasites upon the body politic, giving us the most corrupting and humiliating despotisms in political history. Our legislation is determined by a vast system of lobby. The people know that our legislative methods have become the organization of indirect bribery and corruption. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the chief work of both state and national legislatures in recent years has been to obstruct, defeat or cheat the will of the people."

The money power—not the people dominates legislation. To be more explicit I cite the following FACTS, nearly all bearing on the record of recent legislation, as evidence:

1 The striking down of one-half of our metal money since 1870, thus crushing the debtor class, doing much to bring about the present business paralysis, and giving the creditor class the advantage of a dearer money. Nearly all fixed charges, such as taxes, interest, salaries of officials, railroad rates, the great debts, etc., remain the same while labor and its products have been purposely depressed. The money power alone profited by this legislation, so must be held responsible for it ;—no other class could have had any such interest in it.

2 The professional lobby now regularly employed by corporations at every session of congress and in the various state legislatures.

3 Continued exemption of the rich from paying their just proportion of taxes.

4 The debauching of courts and public officials, as evidenced by the income tax decision, and the manipulation of public funds by banking syndicates and “experts,” as shown by the recent bond issues where millions were made in profits.

5 The substitution of “government by injunction,” for government by the constitution and laws—for the purpose of maintaining property rights above human rights.

6 The striking down of “trial by jury,” as in the Debs case,—another effort to make property rights superior to human rights.

7 A subsidized press in almost every important city, as well as a subsidized news service in the interest of capital and plutocracy. This explains why congress has not—and will not take any action toward the establishment of postal telegraphs and telephones such as other nations enjoy.

8 The persistent refusal of congress to take control of the Union Pacific railroad in the interest of the people when they are practically its owners.

9 The donation by congress of sufficient public lands and guaranteed railroad bonds to build and equip all necessary railroads in the country ; repeated concessions to banking interests ; the various so-called refunding acts, which have each time so changed the terms that a *perpetual bonded debt* is at last saddled on the people ; the British gold-standard system of finance which has so lowered values that our national debt to-day is actually as great as it was thirty years ago, although

about 1600 millions have been paid on principal and interest ; the enormous sums squandered on so-called river and harbor improvement; the 80 millions recently appropriated for " coast defenses" when the present government revenues are insufficient for current expenses ; the persistent refusal of congress to establish postal savings banks in the face of an almost universal demand for them

10 The various scandals in which senators, congressmen and other officials including the president, have been charged with boodle transactions in deals with the Sugar trust, mail contracts, Chicago Gas stock, bond syndicates, etc.

11 Corporation attorneys, like senators Thurston, Vilas, Hill and others, being allowed to hold public and corporate positions at the same time.

12 The encouragement by congress of the militia, and the effort to keep stationed large detachments of regulars near the manufacturing centers—making it manifest that any movement against plutocratic spoliation will be instantly crushed.

13 The fact that the political bosses go to the Whitneys, Rockefellers, Havemeyers and Pullmans for their heavy corruption campaign funds is certainly presumptive evidence that the old parties are mortgaged to wealth from the beginning. (Vide Senator Chandler's charges against Mark Hanna.)

14 Repeal of laws in the various legislatures in the interest of wealth, which regulated the employment of child and female labor. Note also the recent increase in the salaries of United States marshals to \$4,500 a year—more than the average pay of governors.

15 The investigation ordered by the 48th congress of the enormous defalcations under the Grant administrations shows that more than 17 million dollars were stolen between 1869 and 1883, and only a quarter of a million was recovered. This occurred in the signal service and disbursing office of the state department alone. In 1876 Senator Davis, of W. Virginia, got a committee appointed to investigate the condition of the treasury. Through the testimony laid before this committee, together with the examination of the ledgers of the department, it was shown that 2,527 erasures and alterations had been made, and that \$247,768,341 had been stolen, or was wholly unaccounted for.



17 There has been little or no legislation for the past twenty years or more in the interest of the people, but nearly all has been in the interest of wealth in some form or other.

Do not PRESENT CONDITIONS fully attest the truth of every indictment in this long bill of charges—a bill that could easily be extended many times its present length? After reading these specifications of disloyalty to the people—these indictments of perfidy and dishonor—what shall be our answer to the question, “Is political reform necessary?”

### THE NEW TYRANNY IN GOVERNMENT.

“The new tyranny in government,” says Henry D. Lloyd, “is not so stupid or clumsy as to pass laws against free speech or trial by jury or the right of meeting. But it sends its police to break up meetings of workingmen, and its judges kill free speech by deciding that a speaker is responsible for the bad use a fool or a knave may make of his utterances.

“Our administration of law in parallel columns forbids the combination of workingmen and permits the combination of employers. This awkward construction needs not appear in our statute books. It is created by the subtle and more irresistible legislation of judges and attorney-generals. \* \* \* The middle classes of America, who are now helping a few thousand plutocrats to take away the working people’s rights are establishing the mischievous precedent by which when the time comes their own rights will be forfeited.”

The necessity for reform the reader must see is not confined to any one branch or department of our present system; the people are not only permitting the sacrifice of their financial interests, by losing control in their governmental affairs, but even their liberties, as Mr. Lloyd plainly shows, are in imminent danger. Poverty means degradation and servitude; but to lose liberty is to lose all.

The thing to do first is to get the government back into the hands of the people. After this important step it will be no difficult task to restore the common rights of every citizen. Then we would enjoy the advantages of a true democracy, and the money power would become respectable.

A vote for the present system means a vote to perpetuate the rule of the money power. Do you realize its significance?



When we are told that "all free governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and are then informed that we cannot have the privilege of registering a "no" or "yes" on the laws that are to govern us, it is like seating a person at a banquet table in his own house and denying him the right to eat.

### A BRIEF COMPARISON OF GOVERNMENTS.

It is claimed on the authority of Prof. Copeland and others that England possesses a much more thoroughly honest and representative government to-day than we do in this country.

There, a political campaign seldom lasts more than six weeks—generally much less. Ours lasts about six months. In England the new parliament begins its work soon after election, while France and Germany are about as prompt. Even after our long campaigns our new congress does not convene for thirteen months after election;—no other nation is so slow in its political action.

When congress does convene does it carry out the popular will? When has it done so? Then again, there is more wealth in our "house of lords" than in the aristocratic branch of the English parliament, and the influence of this vast wealth on legislation has come to be a generally acknowledged fact.

Our president holds the veto power over congress. The crown of England would not presume to exercise such a dictatorial power over parliament, and has not done so during the past century. Then behind congress and the president stands an irresponsible supreme court, appointed by executives (not by the people) for life, ready whenever the money power requires it to declare the people's demands unconstitutional, as in the income tax decision.

England has only 32 judges, or one for every 940,000 of population. Illinois, with a population of only 4,000,000, has 178 judges, or one for every 22,472 of population. Every state is similarly burdened with the "judge curse."

Our politicians and party leaders have a great deal to say about our superior advantages under "free government" when even semi-barbarous Russia can give us pointers, and her government-controlled railroads and telegraphs are a success, and are conducted in the interest of the people—not corporations,

and with a much lower rates than we pay. But the same may be said of all nations of consequence outside of North America except Turkey, Spain and England, and England's control of her railroads is so severe as to amount to almost confiscation. There are 43 cities in Great Britain that control their own franchises, and only one or so in this country. England has for many years enjoyed the advantages of postal savings banks and postal telegraphs and telephones. But these are common almost everywhere away from home—if it was not for the money power they would be common here.

#### ANOTHER SIDE TO THE MATTER.

But is it fair to institute a comparison between a young republic like this and old, impoverished nations? For example: the claim is made that our people are more prosperous than those of other nations. Look at the facts a moment: Great Britain comprises 121,150 square miles—a little more than double the area of Illinois, and has 39,000,000 population, or more than 322 to the square mile, while we have only 20. Only six per cent. of our resources are developed while England's are approaching the point of exhaustion. Holland has more than 500 to the square mile and Sweden has more than twelve times our number to the square mile. These figures are given merely as expressing the condition of nearly all the countries of the old world. Yet in the face of these facts, and with abundant harvests in the United States more than 200,000 working people have left our shores for these impoverished, crowded, monarchical countries across the sea during the past two years to better their conditon.

Could any comment be more suggestive of the utter lack of wisdom and sound policy on the part of our dominant political parties than this fact? When a political system in a republic becomes so intolerable as to drive 200,000 people out of the country—and into such a hell as the old world offers—isn't it about time that all good people were striving for a change? If natural conditions were anything as bad as our political conditions are what would become of the people?

Here is another phase of the question: Our population doubles every twenty-five years. If two million of our people are now seeking in vain for employment, what is almost certain to be the situation ten years hence when our population exceeds 100 million? Will any thoughtful person contend

that the present policy of our dominant parties would meet the requirements of such a population when so many of our present sparse population are now living as Florence Kelley has said, "in a perpetual hell in which the conditions are becoming more and more intolerable?"

Why not exercise the same judgment in political matters that we do in other matters—discard that which has proved inefficient and adopt that which has given best results in the experiment of free government?

Wendell Phillips said: "Responsibility educates." Direct Legislation would increase interest in better government.

### POSTAL SAVINGS BANKS.

In England these institutions were established in 1861; in Canada in 1868; in Austria-Hungary in 1883; they have also been established in France, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, Sweden, India, Ceylon, Finland, Japan, Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, Hawaii and Trinidad. Postal savings banks have been adopted by almost every civilized nation in the world except the United States.

Why should we not have them? Dr. C. F. Taylor states in *The Medical World* that he has corresponded with a large number of congressmen on the subject, and in reply to this question, W. W. Bower, member of congress from San Diego, Calif., sent a copy of his "Postal Savings Bill," which has been pending in congress for years, and writes: "Bankers and money sharks do not want any postal saving system. That is the answer to your 'why not?'"

Every political party of any importance in the present campaign, except the republican party, has declared in favor of postal savings banks. Has the money power a better hold on this party than on the others? Has it come to the point that we cannot secure the advantages that other nations enjoy? Reader, how does this suit you? Isn't it about time we were adopting Direct Legislation, direct common sense or something else?

It is well known that these institutions encourage small savings, and a citizen with a bank account (unless unreasonably large) is usually a better, steadier and a more patriotic citizen than one without a bank account. With Direct Legislation the question of postal savings banks could be settled



at any election on national issues, also the question of public ownership of telegraphs and telephones, and their being made part of our postal system, as they are in England, Switzerland, and in many other countries.

The money power will continue in control of these matters so long as the people are denied the right of self rule.

### SECTIONALISM AND THE PRESENT SYSTEM.

The slave power was responsible for the so-called "Mason and Dixon's line"—for the long continued hatred between the North and the South. Shall the money power be permitted to rend the East and West in a similar manner?

In thousands of pamphlets, newspapers and books the West is to-day asserting itself to be wronged and robbed by the East, and a feeling of bitter hatred and enmity for New England has arisen beyond the Mississippi. Millions of western people are beginning to inquire why all this distress when there has been no famine; why the producers of wealth are homeless and moneyless while those who produce no wealth dissipate in measureless luxury? They read in the government statistical reports of 1890 that Massachusetts alone gained more wealth from 1880 to 1890 than Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and North Carolina that contain SEVEN TIMES the population and FIFTY-EIGHT TIMES the territory. They well know that unjust, money-controlled legislation is responsible for this outrageous condition.

It is reported that in some parts of the West it is almost unsafe to say you are from Massachusetts. Commercial travelers claim that many Western merchants will not even look at eastern goods. Some even claim that the thirteen colonies have become financially annexed to England, and that nothing now remains of the American people but the western states.

These are Herbert N. Casson's words: "What England is to Ireland, what Spain is to Cuba, the East is to the West. Massachusetts has become the American Gypsy-moth, feeding on the fruitage of the West."

In 1889 the farm mortgages of the West amounted to almost \$3,500,000,000, and during the last thirteen years in Minnesota alone 33,453 farmers were sold out. These farmers



raised good crops, but were obliged year after year to sell below cost of production—potatoes 83 cents a ton, and grain correspondingly low. The shrinkage of values caused by an insufficient and shrinking money volume has well nigh bankrupted the West. Is it any wonder the western people claim that the money power has but two planks in its gold platform: "There's nothing to arbitrate," and "The public be damned."

Let us not commit the same blunder in this case we did with the slave power. For the sake of the union—for the sake of national honor—these conditions must be righted. How is it to be done under a system that sees no injustice in all the law-made inequalities of the present—a system that defends every form of corporate greed, tyranny and oppression?

### TRADE UNIONS AND DIRECT LEGISLATION.

The history of the trade-union movement in the United States is similar to that of Great Britain in many respects. In a political sense it has been a decided failure.

With a membership of about 1,000,000, according to the estimate kindly furnished me by August McCraith, the labor-union vote of the United States is thrown in such a way that no more notice is taken of it by politicians and political parties than any equal number of unorganized voters. This immense vote, like the farmer vote, is frittered away year after year as far as securing any practical benefits for workingmen is concerned. It has not so much as a single representative in congress or in any of the various state legislatures.

If the trade union vote could unite in adopting Direct Legislation it could and would be speedily adopted. Then what a change could and would be made in this political "comedy of errors."

John Burns, the acknowledged leader of the English trade-union movement, has given his views in the following words—and we in America might do well to profit by them:

"Have our labor unions repaid the expenditure of labor and money it has cost to maintain them? The political benefits have been little or nothing where we should have received our greatest returns. The benefits we have derived from organization have been in maintaining a living scale of wages, and in reality this is about all we have gained. It seems next to impossible for us to secure a united vote in the

interest of labor on account of factions and parties. If every British trade unionist would advocate Direct Legislation—would unite on this one reform, which in my judgment is the most important political reform at this time,—I believe we could accomplish more for the cause of labor in one year than we have accomplished during the past forty years.”

Let me ask these questions of every trade unionist who reads these words: Is there any other issue on earth that gives any promise of uniting the organized labor vote of the country? Is there any other issue that would be half as servicable or permanent in its benefits to the cause of labor? Then why not be wise enough to drop all differences, and unite on this bed-rock reform?

Direct Legislation is by all odds the quickest, best and most direct route out of our industrial hell. Will you take it?

#### HOW THIS REFORM WOULD HELP FARMERS.

In many ways Direct Legislation would be of inestimable advantage to our great body of farmers now numbering about 34 millions,—many times the largest of our industrial classes.

As a body farmers have never had anything like just and fair representation in any of our law-making bodies. The fact is lawyers have enjoyed a monopoly in law-making to the disadvantage of all classes except themselves and the money power. It is said there are to-day 230 lawyers in congress. May not this be the explanation of the fact that the people's interests in matters of legislation have been so outrageously neglected?

The Supreme Judge of the Republic of Switzerland is a farmer. He was installed in office by the people for the reason that he is considered an honest man of good judgment, and the Swiss hold these qualifications to be of more importance in the award of justice than mere technical ability.

The Swiss method of direct vote would insure our farmers fair representation,—would give them the opportunity to represent themselves. “Lawyer-made laws” would then be quoted at a discount. Under this system agriculture would not be likely to remain at the bottom round of the industrial ladder. The farmers have been trying a government by the politicians—how does it suit? Why not try Direct Legislation?

The question of Direct Legislation is of vastly more importance than the slavery question was. The rights and liberties of only four million people were involved in the slavery controversy while the rights and liberties of more than 65 million people will be favorably affected by this reform.

### EVERYTHING DEPENDS ON UNITED ACTION.

If all the elements opposed to the domination of plutocracy would UNITE the "rule of the people" could be secured before the close of 1896.

It seems that there are thousands of voters who do not fully understand that Direct Legislation is AN ISSUE in this campaign. For some reason the party newspapers have systematically ignored the issue, and will no doubt continue to do so, until the people educate the newspapers to the importance of the reform. Most all reliable and pains-taking newspapers would undoubtedly be benefited by the adoption of this reform—it would awaken increased interest in public affairs, and the papers would receive the first and greatest benefits resulting from such an educational change. The newspapers CANNOT AFFORD TO DISREGARD PUBLIC INTEREST IN THIS MATTER. If they do they will certainly be accused of mercenary motives in any effort to deprive the people of self-rule.

To keep the people divided seems to have been the studied policy of the money power in all ages and in all countries. "Divide and conquer" has invariably been the slogan of wealth. A fine illustration of this fact is afforded by the English aristocracy in its treatment of Ireland. It has encouraged divisions simply for convenience of robbery and extortion, and generally on religion. When the catholics are pulling the ears of the protestants the landlords and officials are industriously picking the pockets of both. In this country the tariff question has well served a similar purpose.

Now the question that should interest all patriotic voters is what change can be adopted that will insure popular rule in place of the present rule of money? Otherwise how can we reasonably expect better conditions? Will the thousands who now feel the heavy hand of organized greed quietly submit much longer to injustice for the sake of peace?

Is there any other issue but "the rule of the people" that



could possibly unite the support of the single-taxer, the prohibitionist, the socialist and philosophical anarchist? If free silver is adopted it will at most be but a palliative measure. *We must possess the means for securing other and better reforms.* Then why should not every editor, speaker and writer advocate Direct Legislation as THE ISSUE from this time forth? This issue includes every other.

Our rights and liberties are gradually being abridged, not only by the money power, but also by OTHER influences. Do you doubt it? Then read carefully the "Loud Postal bill," an infamous measure recently reported and recommended for passage by the committee on postoffices. It provides that certain corporations shall have their letters carried at a reduced rate by using stamping machines placed in business houses; and postmasters at delivery offices are to keep a record of all these letters, report them to the department, and the government collect the postage from each corporation, LESS A CERTAIN DISCOUNT.

It will be seen at once that this would open the way for any amount of fraud, as the honesty of postmasters in reporting the correct number of letters might be influenced by friendship or money. It gives the big concerns a reduced postage rate which of itself is bad enough, but by no means the most objectionable and dangerous provision of the bill which lies in the fact that a large amount of newspapers and periodicals will be shut out of the mails by giving the delivery postmaster a *censorship* over publications, and he can deliver them or not at his pleasure. (This is a feature of the Russian postal system.) Other dangerous provisions of this bill are omitted for want of space.

I desire also to call attention of the reader, especially if he is an editor or publisher, to a bill introduced by Senator Vilas last December, which has been read twice and referred to the committee on judiciary, and which provides a penalty of \$5,000, or imprisonment for five years, or both, for sending any book, pamphlet, paper, letter or print through the express companies, or by any common carrier, which shall not meet the approval of self-appointed CENSORS of the Anthony Comstock type. Congressman D. B. Henderson's bill, which is substantially an amendment to the so-called Comstock postal law, is another infamous measure of the same character.



These bills, and scores of others that might be mentioned, clearly show the drift of legislation. They are all assaults on individual and natural rights, in favor of bigotry—in favor of “the patent moralist.” They infringe upon personal liberty, and are besides a flagrant invasion of the sacred privacy of the home. Any person who will even pretend to represent the people, and accept a salary for such service, and will then be contemptible enough to propose such laws, ought to be imprisoned at hard labor for life. A member of congress, or any other person, who would make it unlawful to mail such publications as Anna Besant’s “*Law of Population*,” or Dr. E. B. Foote’s “*Medical Essays*,” and other similar works, is not only a traitor to free government, free speech and free press, but is also an enemy of the race.

Russian methods are certainly being engrafted into our present system, and a remedy must be applied. The friends of freedom of publication cannot act too quickly or too wisely. If the abridgement of liberty in this direction continues the dominant party will ultimately tolerate no criticism of its administration of government.—Recent “contempt of court” proceedings point unmistakably to this result.

Are we ready for a Russian censor in every village post-office?—But this is one of the provisions of the “*Loud Postal bill*,” which has been recommended for passage by the committee on postoffices. What can more certainly avert such a calamity than Direct Legislation? In many of its forms such a calamity is already upon us.

Without the freedom of speech and press no people can be free or government secure. So why should we not look with alarm upon every assault on natural and individual rights?

### **SOME OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.**

The stock argument against Direct Legislation is that it would be impracticable in so large a country as this while it might be successful in a small republic like Switzerland.

I answer, that we have adopted fifteen amendments to our national constitution by the Referendum principle—if we can vote as a nation on issues of this kind—why can we not vote on all national issues of importance?

In Switzerland only a small percentage of the measures adopted by their Federal Assembly are referred to the people,

But the fact that the people have the power to *demand* the Referendum when they choose exerts a salutary influence over the law-making body, which is plainly noticeable to-day in the conditions that prevail throughout that model republic. That we stand in need of such an influence in this country cannot truthfully be denied.

There is nothing impracticable about Direct Legislation for this or any other country. In state, county and municipal affairs it has come to be even *as great a necessity*.

### THE MONEY QUESTION.

Some one has said: "The American people must learn the lesson of money, or they are lost." Our space allows of only a thought or two on this subject. After the interminable discussions for so many months through this campaign on the questions of "ratios," "standard of values," "primary" and "redemption money," "international bimetalism," etc., etc., the reader will find that the money question *will not be settled* until settled by Direct Legislation. The silver vote will be *counted out* in some way, even if in the majority. The money power may be depended on to go to any extreme to further its interests.

The tariff question is also as far from settlement to-day as it was twenty years ago—this is another issue that must be settled directly by the people through the Referendum—if ever settled. The politicians and those with self-interests, have furnished the evidence that they are neither fit nor able to settle this issue.

Under the first administration of President Lincoln 60 million dollars were issued in demand treasury notes, and made legal tender for all debts, public and private—equal to coin. *This was the most perfect money ever known to civilization.*—"the Abraham Lincoln greenbacks." They could not be cornered and speculated in; they bore no interest, were good in every state for their full face value, and were as "sound" as the United States government, because backed by the billions of property of all the people.

But in an evil hour congress—influenced by the money power—demonetized these greenbacks by allowing the concession known as the exception clause—"except duties on imports and interest on the public debt." This at once gave the owners of

gold a monopoly, and they have well maintained that monopoly ever since. The history of our financial legislation shows numbers of concessions made to the money power similar to this one, and which have resulted in the loss of untold millions to the people. It is the same old, robber gold ring to-day.

As long as we use money with so-called intrinsic value (except perhaps for subsidiary coin,) there will be trouble. It will fluctuate; it will be hoarded, monopolized and held out of circulation in a thousand different ways—either silver or gold. That money should have intrinsic value is simply a superstition, and defeats the object for which money is intended. It also works to the decided advantage of money monopoly. "Any power able to control our volume of money," said Garfield, "is able to control all business transactions."

There is no longer any question that it would be greatly to the advantage of the people if *both gold and silver* could be demonetized in the interest of a sufficient issue of United States treasury notes to abundantly transact the business of the country. But if the money power will not allow the people to put out such an issue of national treasury notes, then the next best thing is the use of BOTH silver and gold as primary or redemption money. Gold monometalism certainly cannot be in the interest of any but the creditor class, and only the money speculators and mortgage sharks of this class would be materially benefitted. "This country has never been prosperous under the gold standard," says the *Chicago Record*, and yet the money power has been able to mislead many good and intelligent men on this question.

The *Chicago Tribune* admits that it is possible for a few bankers to corner the present gold supply. If this statement from this gold-standard paper is true it ought to be sufficient reason for bimetalism if no other reason could be given.

If the maintenance of our British gold standard could be voted on directly by the people independent of party environment who doubts a large majority would not be against it?

Is it not a little strange that nearly all who live off the toil of others—those who corrupt legislation and thrive by very questionable methods—are striving for the gold standard?

#### THE TARIFF ISSUE.

Every voter whose eyes are so full of tariff sand that he can see no other issue should bear in mind that with McKinley's



election there is scarcely a possibility of any increase in the present tariff for *at least two years*, or until the present political status of the Senate is changed. The coming election will not affect the present Senate, which is opposed to any increase in tariff duties. This situation furnishes another object lesson of the perfection (?) of the present system. Think of a political system that affords no opportunity for two years or more to correct the tariff blunders the politicians have made !

### RELIGION AND PRESENT CONDITIONS.

Thousands in our churches have hardly thought it worth while to consider the influence exerted by present conditions on the growth of Christian teaching. Supposed self-interest, in many cases, stands in the way of any such inquiry.

The church stands to-day unmistakably on the side of the "capitalist class," and this class is a very small *minority*. This policy, whether right or wrong, has resulted in estranging from the church practically the great laboring masses, especially in cities. Church statistics in Chicago, New York city and even in Indianapolis show that less than 15 per centage of the population attend church, and this per centage is decreasing.

When we consider that more than half of our population is urban, and taking these three cities as a basis, the religious outlook is on a par with the present political situation. It will not be disputed that the ranks of organized labor—with their million membership—have been decidedly outspoken in their charges not only of a venal press, but a venal, cowardly pulpit as well. Does it not appear from this survey that *some radical change must be made* ?

The census reports relating to the increase of crime in the United States show that in 1850 there was one criminal in every 3,448 of population, while in 1890 there was one in every 757 of the population. The *Chicago Tribune* states that crime in Chicago—under the Swift-republican administration—has increased 15 per cent. over that of 1895, and 34 per cent. over that of 1894. The reader will hardly question the *Tribune's* statements;—as a gold-standard paper it makes a specialty of giving all information as to the *practical working* of the British gold standard. This rapid increase of crime is at least suggestive if our churches—as well as most of the big daily newspapers—are not truckling entirely too much to the money power to be of any great service to the masses.



Any industrial or economic system—although defended by the church—that allows a few to beggar and starve the many, that defends monopoly control of any natural product or necessity of life, should be despised by all. Did Christ favor any such plan? To say that he did would be to offer an insult to his life-long ministry. Christ had no message for the rich, yet wealth dominates the church to-day. May this not be the reason why so many believe that of the two institutions, politics and religion, the latter needs reforming most?

Can the interests of religion be best conserved by the few or the many? Can the church maintain itself if present conditions continue; and if our political system continues how can we reasonably expect improvement? If you believe in God and the people more than you do in politicians and political parties, why not VOTE that way—VOTE as you pray?

\* \* \* \*

“I believe in the capacity of the American people for self-government. I have believed at all times that power could safely be intrusted with the people. This was the doctrine of Washington, of Jefferson, of Lincoln. And no other political system is so admirably adapted to secure this result as the Swiss method of Direct Legislation.”—*From a speech by Hon. Wm. J. Bryan, delivered in Omaha, September, 1895.*

\* \* \* \*

“Representative law-making is costly and oftentimes very unsatisfactory. It is well known that public interests suffer because representatives abuse their power. A “direct vote” would remedy all this, and we must come to it sooner or later.”—*Gov. John P. Altgeld.*

\* \* \* \*

“It is a question in my mind whether any voter is a good citizen who opposes the ‘rule of the people.’”—*Mayor Hazen S. Pingree.*

\* \* \* \*

PRESENT CONDITIONS are a libel upon civilization; a slander on every school, college and university the world over.

If there is one law supreme in hell it must be the law of capitalism as applied to-day.

Must the effort of all who love justice, truth and right continue powerless to stay the ever increasing avalanche of human want and suffering? Is fraternity a myth and kindly feeling a sign of failing business tact?

## THE PRESENT DUTY OF YOUNG MEN.

"THE AGE IS WEARY OF CAMP FOLLOWERS, WEARY OF SERVILITY, WEARY OF CRINGED NECKS AND KNEES BENT TO CORRUPTION."

The old Greek said, 'KNOW THYSELF.' But the admonition of the best and wisest of all ages has been, "BE THYSELF."

The urgent need of the day is unselfish men of courage and conviction.—Men who dare face depraved public opinion, and who will not bow at the shrine of a money-god.—Men intelligent and patriotic enough to protest against the growing power and corrupting influence of excessive wealth.

"No structure of government," said Lincoln, "can endure unless founded upon justice. There must be one law for all, and equality under that law. The slave power must not be resurrected in a more oppressive and tyrannizing money power."

Young men too often fail to realize the necessity for political reform. The intrigues and machinations of corrupt and servile men have not yet warped their honest aims nor bedimmed their ardent dreams of a noble future. They too often overlook the facts in history which ought to serve as semaphores for the guidance of republics.

If it is true that opinions practically become fixed at fifty year of age, then it is evident that the hope and security of free government lies with the intelligent, unprejudiced vote of all young men who prize patriotism more than partyism.

In the foregoing pages I have endeavored, in my poor way, to show the necessity for such political action at this time as will restore the ancient rights of government. I sincerely believe that this change must be made if we are to continue as a free people;—in fact we are far from being a *free* people now, and every day that such action is deferred only aggravates and imperils the situation. The money power has already involved us in panic, ruin and suffering beyond description of human language. To say the situation is not fraught with danger is to say the abolition of slavery did not at one time imperil the national Union.

Is there necessity, justification or apology for PRESENT CONDITIONS? Is there any justice or fairness in the right of private monopoly of any natural product or necessity of life? Why should not the public transact the public business? Why should almost every industry be controlled by monopolies and combines? Why should there be any such thing as a money monopoly in a republic where the people are supposed to have the right of self-rule? The money power has been allowed to hold undisputed sway so long that the nation is at last beginning to feel the force of its soulless grasp.

Myron Haynes, of Chicago, recently addressed these words to a gathering of old soldiers :

“It is more rare to find men loyal to the best interests of the country in the calm, cool eventide of peace than in the hot noonday of war. In time of peace the men who stand for patriotism are often sneered at, maligned and accursed ; while in time of war heroes are applauded and patriots loved.

“This country is in greater danger to-day than it was in 1861. Why? Because our foes are not drawn up behind forts or arrayed in companies, regiments and platoons. They are not openly assailing the flag. In the guise of respectable citizens men are undermining the institutions which alone can perpetuate our liberties, and are sapping the manhood which furnishes the only true material for freeman. \* \* Rather than forfeit our glorious heritage by our indifference and cowardice at this time it were better that the Union should have gone down amid the confusion of civil strife.

“I look to you, peaceful citizens, for a sublimer manifestation of courage than that for which we applauded you as soldiers. You saved your country once ; you love it now. Then be true to her interests in the present emergency.”

Let me state a fact in closing which the paid ability of the world cannot explain away: In the year 1840, according to government statistics, labor's share was 60 per cent. of all that was produced that year, and capital's share was 40 per cent. In 1890 labor's share was 17 per cent., and capital's share 83 per cent. Now, if we estimate that the capitalist class in 1890 comprised about four millions and the laboring class not less than 62 millions, these statistics at once furnish the proof why there is less and less prosperity among the masses from year to year. When we come to divide 17 per cent. of the annual product, say for 1895, among at least 65



## *The Only Way Out.*

million people—the laboring class—we see at once that it is not sufficeint to decently feed, clothe and shelter this number.

If our present money system was the pink of perfection, and our tariff schedules made out by McKinley and the recording angels, we could not then be a prosperous nation. After capital takes its demands there is not enough left of any annual product to house, feed and clothe the laboring masses.

Demagogues, partisan orators and editors may use sophistry ever so thick, but they cannot cover up this fact :—*The laboring masses cannot live like American citizens ought to live, and educate their children, when they receive but 17 per cent. of what they actually produce.*

After all it is really not a question of democracy, republicanism or partyism. The question is whether we shall allow the money power to mortgage the earth, while we stand supinely by defending the present order of things until this damnable power even mortgages the birthright of our children.

Is it not time the people were taking this matter into their own hands, and is it possible for them to do so under the present system? We must hold the republican and democratic parties responsible for the fact that capital's share in this young republic is 83 per cent. of each annual product. For twenty years or more congress seems to have labored for this result.—Millions for corporations and monopolies—and what for workingmen?—Simply warnings to “keep off the grass.”

One of the charges against Charles the First was that he had created and fostered monopolies. His head went to the block. Our law-making bodies have been doing this thing so long that the people have grown indifferent to this outrage against common honesty.

Daniel Webster said: “The freest government cannot long endure when the tendency of the law is to create a rapid accumulation of property in the hands of a few, and render the masses of the people poor and dependent.”—The very thing Webster warned us against has been strictly carried out until we now have on the one hand more than 4,000 millionaires and on the other thousands who are losing or have already lost their homes, and other thousands who are actually destitute.

It is the people *versus* the money power, although thousands of partisans do not realize it now as they will later on.

Nearly every great struggle of the English race has been caused by the exaction of tribute—the extortion of greed. Is it best for any people or government that labor's share of the annual product shall in a few years drop from 60 to 17 per cent., and still tend downward? *Let present conditions be the answer.*—Mark my words—this fall has already proceeded beyond the danger line!

Dr. Hirsch says: “The law is the will of the people in only one country—Switzerland.” Why should not *our* law be the will of the people?—The masses are searching for the reasons.

The reader will recall to mind Macaulay's prophesy made in 1858?—that staunch defender of English royalty and vested rights. “The time will come,” he said, “when New England will be as thickly peopled as old England. Wages will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and your Birminghams, and in those cities thousands of artisans will sometimes be out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. \* \* It is quite evident that your government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority. For in a republic the majority is the government, and has the rich, who are a small minority, absolutely at its mercy.”

Macaulay naturally believed that in a so-called representative democracy like the United States, a majority of the people would rule. He little dreamed that our republic in 1896 would be a prototype in many of its worst aspects of the British kingdom, and with the money power even more firmly entrenched. He little thought that on the shores of the new world would so quickly spring up the *most powerful plutocracy ever known among men*,—a plutocracy under which 1 per cent. of the population owns and controls more property than the remaining 99 per centum.

But the strangest thing of all is that the political parties that have allowed this crime and misery-breeding condition to come about—in fact have brought it about—have the “gall” and effrontery to again ask to be installed in power. In the case of the democratic party, however, there is some measure of justification in this act. There are new, fearless and consecrated men for its leaders, while the old, corrupting and corruptable spell-binders of the party are nearly all arrayed on the side of monopoly and the money power. It is a *new* democracy that has in many of its state platforms alrea

clared in favor of Direct Legislation. So much in its favor.

In George William Curtis' description of the slave power of forty years ago he closes with these words: "It silenced the preacher in his pulpit; it muzzled the editor at his desk and the professor in his lecture room. It tore the golden rule from the school books and the pictured benignity of Christ from the prayer books." This slave power let us hope is forever crushed. The auction block and whipping post are but tragic memories. After the appalling sacrifice of a million lives and 5,000 millions in treasure this infamy of infamies no longer pollutes the nation's honor. But in its stead is now to be found the money power—a thousand times—yes, ten thousand times more calamitous and destructive to the liberties, hopes and happiness of the common people.

Young man, you love justice—you have pride in your love of country.—I appeal to both. The sea of life is wide and wild and strange; we cannot know what lies beyond the rise of a day's journey; but we can be sure that a small minority in this or in any other country will not long be able *to hold by force* an intelligent, increasing majority at the border-line of actual want and misery. WE MUST BE JUST.

If you prefer the torch of progress to the torch of the incendiary; if you prefer general prosperity to the demoralizing opulence of a few, I entreat you to think seriously if you can consistently throw your influence on the side of a *representative* democracy when a *social* democracy, in which the people possess the opportunity to represent and govern themselves, calls for your support.

You love fair play; then vote your convictions. Throw off the party collar and stand for principle. The world may be slow to applaud you, but the hosts who are being devoured by the hyenas of greed and the tigers of injustice will call you blessed. The fullest justice from this time to our under-fed and over-worked millions must be but meager reparation for the long, cruel past. Shall we be honorable enough to discharge the obligation so far as we are able?

Will the bandage of self-interest never fall from our eyes?

It always has been—must it always be—oppressors and oppressed? Will the sun of civilization never emerge from the cloud of gold that darkens the world?

I plead for simple justice—for what is best in intelligent, African manhood. SELF-RULE IS AN INALIENABLE RIGHT—  
" JUSTICE. It cannot—it must not longer be denied.







# Books That Point The Way

---

TO A SOCIAL ORDER FOUNDED ON  
JUSTICE AND BROTHERHOOD

**Merrie England.** By Robert Blatchford. Paper, 190 pages, ten cents.

**Uncle Sam In Business.** By Daniel Bond, an Old Soldier of the Republic. Paper, ten cents.

**The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand.** By Dr. C. W. Wooldridge. Paper, ten cents.

**The Outlook for the Artisan and His Art.** By J. Pickering Putman, of the Boston Society of Architects. Paper, ten cents.

**The Drift of Our Time.** By Prof. Frank Parsons. Paper, ten cents.

**President John Smith.** By Frederick Upham Adams. Paper, twenty-five cents; cloth, \$1.00.

**The Co-opolitan.** A Story of the Co-operative Commonwealth of Idaho. By Francis H. Clarke. Paper, twenty-five cents.

**Man or Dollar, Which?** By A Newspaper Man. Paper, twenty-five cents.

**Evolutionary Politics.** By Walter Thomas Mills. Paper, twenty-five cents; cloth, \$1.00.

**The Legal Revolution of 1902.** By A Law-Abiding Revolutionist. Paper, fifty cents; cloth, \$1.00.



Any of these books will be mailed promptly on receipt of price.  
Full catalogue free. Address,

---

## CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

Publishers of Social Reform Literature,

56 FIFTH AVENUE,

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.